

THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW  
OF

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

OCTOBER, 1893.

---

ARTICLE I.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

By C. S. ALBERT, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

Worship is characteristic of humanity. Wherever man is found, he is a worshiper. This worship in its purity and truth, varies with his conceptions of his relations with the superhuman and mysterious powers on which he believes himself to depend. Worship is a necessity of his nature. There is a worship of man which illustrates the divine worship. Wherever and whenever man meets another nobler and stronger than himself, he naturally reverences the superior. It is the source of hero worship. Divine worship arises instinctively whenever man conceives himself to be in relation to superhuman and mysterious powers on which he believes himself to depend.

It was at one time supposed that there were savages so degraded as to be without religion and worship. A more accurate knowledge and a more familiar acquaintance disclose the rudiments of both. The "Black Fellows" of Australia were supposed to be without religion and worship. After their confidence was won by a friendly Englishman they gave a statement of their belief, which they had hitherto concealed from the white man for politic reasons. Worship and religion are correlated.

\*Lecture on the Baugher Foundation, delivered June 7th, 1893, in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

The essence of religion will be the essence of worship. The profounder the religion, the profounder will be the worship. In worship religion finds fittest expression, for the inward faith must express itself in outward act, and the highest of all religious acts will be the worship of God; and it is this which God Himself desires, even as Jesus said, "The Father seeketh such to worship Him." John 4 : 23.

We are confronted to-day by two theories of religion. The one is the theory of evolution, the other of revelation. The former divides into two schools. The one claims the emotions as the source of religion, the other the reason. "According to the one view man instinctively attempted to put himself into relations with the superhuman influences by which he felt himself surrounded and it was only subsequently that he thought of defining them. No one in our day has formulated this thesis with more eloquence than M. Renan who compares man's religious impulses to the instinct that makes the hen-bird "sit," which instinct spontaneously declares itself as soon as the appropriate stage is reached.

Others on the contrary maintain that before worshiping his gods, man must have had some conception of their nature and that the sentiments he entertains toward them must of necessity flow from the ideas he has formed of their character and workings."<sup>\*</sup>

It is evident that whether we take the one standpoint, or the other, or combine them, religion is altogether subjective, dependent upon man and his thought. There is and can be no certainty of God for the development of religion proceeds in the same manner as it began. Man creates his god and creates his worship. God does not reveal himself that he may be truly known and truly worshiped.

The other theory is the theory of the Scriptures, of revelation, God made man in his own image, entered into communion with him, so that man originally possessed a partial but true knowledge of God and his will. This relation was broken by sin, but was not altogether destroyed. Man, though fallen, has retained some knowledge of God and his will. God is not

\*Hibbert Lectures, D'Alviella, 48.

even known by the natural man objectively, but subjectively. Objective knowledge of God comes to man through revelation.

Worship has been similarly affected with religion. It was pure and true before the fall. It was perverted through sin. It became subjective, resting upon the conceptions and reasonings of men. "They sought the Lord, if haply they might feel after him and find him." Acts 17:27. There were no divine channels ordained of God by which man might approach him or receive his gifts. God indeed graciously accepted their adoration and prayer and service and gave them blessing, but they were in the shadow of darkness waiting for light. Yet let it be remembered that they that use imperfect means faithfully may be more acceptable than those who formally use the revelation of his will and the means of grace.

"There is in the Mennevi Sherif of Jelâhi-d'-Dîn, the illustrious saint and doctor of Islam, a striking and pathetic story in which this great lesson is powerfully inculcated. Moses, we read, in his wanderings in the wilderness came upon a shepherd, who was praying to God in the fervor of his soul and saying, 'Oh, my Master, my Lord, would that I knew where I might find thee and become thy servant. Would that I might tie thy shoe latchet and comb thy hair and wash thy robes, and kiss thy beautiful feet, and sweep thy chamber and serve the milk of my goats to thee, for whom my heart crieth out.' And the anger of Moses was kindled and he said to the shepherd, 'Thou blasphemest. The Most High has no body and no need of nourishment, nor of a chamber, nor of a domestic: Thou art an infidel.' And the heart of the shepherd was darkened, for he could make to himself no image of one without bodily form and corporal wants, and he gave himself up to despair and ceased to serve God. And God spake unto Moses and said, 'Why hast thou driven my servant away from me? Every man has received from me his mode of being, his way of speech. What is evil to thee is good in another. What is poison to thee is honey to him. Words are nothing to me. I regard the heart. The compass serves only to direct those without the Kébeh within no one knows the use of it.' God deals in love with

all men and judges them by their opportunity and their spirit.\*

True worship in the Christian sense is communion between God and those who worship him. It is not merely communion of man with God in praise and prayer, but communion of God with man. It is fully established by the Mediator Christ Jesus, through whom God is reconciled to man and man is reconciled to God. By him sin is forgiven, sonship restored and the joy of fellowship given. Whilst men approach God in his name, in praise and prayer, so also his word and sacraments are the divine channels by which God can confer his grace upon men. Worship is thus both objective and subjective.

The worship of Judaism was true and real because God constituted it and he took part in it, but it was preparatory. Around it were the national limitations, the exclusiveness of set laws for a particular period. It was indeed a true communion of the only true God with men and of men with God and a communion of men with each other in this fellowship, but it was partial and temporary, shadow more than substance, much of its service being typical looking forward to its fulfilment in the complete redemption and revelation of Christ Jesus.

Christ is both the founder of the Christian Church and also of its worship. He is not a new lawgiver however, or a prescriber of ceremonials, through the observance of which men can alone participate in salvation. He has given the essentials of worship, out of which the Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit develops its forms. Christianity, restoring through Jesus Christ the communion of God and man, accomplishes this by the heart and life fellowship of believers with their Saviour and through him with God. It is essentially spiritual and therefore its worship in its innermost essence is spiritual. It is in the heart and from the heart. Our Lord has strictly defined worship as spiritual: "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth. (John 4 : 24.)

Spirituality is therefore fundamental, but the question remains how shall this spirituality manifest itself? It has been held that spirituality needs no outward and visible forms, that

---

\*On Right and Wrong, Lilly.

these detract from it and materialize it. Or that there should be no fixed forms, that liturgical worship tends to formalism and spiritual deadness. It is rather remarkable that the example of our Saviour should be so ignored. The details of the last Passover indicate that he observed the ritual of the Jews, to the minute observances then in use. The hymn, Mark 14 : 26, was most probably the second portion of the Hallel.\* He thus indicates that when he spoke of spiritual worship, he did not mean that spirituality should be without form, but that it should guide us in the use of form.

The view that spirituality and fixed form are opposed is "the view of a false spiritualism which ignores the nature and the multiplied needs of the religious life. We are never so spiritual as to live out of the body. The more refined the mind is, the more refined will be a man's conversation, but the mind does not so refine that words become too gross a medium for it." Max Müller insists that there is no thought without language. Paul declares "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness: but with the lips confession is made unto salvation," the audible and outward completing the inward. "To be absolved from bondage to the bodily is not to forego the uses of the body which God has ordained. The visible and audible are not antagonistic to the spiritual, but its genuine organs and the last condition of perfected man is that in which the glorified body is to be the instrument of the soul.

The more spiritual the soul of religion is the more glorious and heavenly, but not the less real is the body with which it is invested for that soul also desires not to be unclothed but clothed upon. Inasmuch as religion is neither a mere matter of the intellect nor of external acts, but a thing of the whole inner man and has its deepest seat in the emotions of the heart, cultus cannot exclusively nor primarily consist in instruction nor in exhortation to duty, but, it must aim at reaching the inmost life of man. Worship though without the form of instruction is profound in instruction. In nothing which we find in the house of God are we so dependent on the house of God as in worship. We can measurably find in our homes what the sermon supplies,

---

\*Edersheim *Life of Christ* Vol. II. 533.

but to lose the worship is to sustain what is humanly an irreparable loss. While worship calls forth the religious emotions, or helps them to give themselves expression, it will of itself react upon the religious thought and upon the moral sentiments and thus with the religious aesthetic aim, it also fulfils the moral aim. So far as the church is a place of worship we do not go there to learn new things or even old ones. We worship best when all the forms are stamped upon the memory. Nevertheless in that deepest and rarest instruction which writes upon the heart what men have been vainly imagining they knew because they could repeat its phrase, *cultus* teaches.\*

We must not be led astray by the phrase simplicity in worship, as though simplicity were spirituality. As Dr. Rowland justly says: "It deserves also to be said just here, that what is called simplicity in worship is oftentimes only another name for the grossest irreverence and slovenliness. Time-honored customs and prejudices are frequently covers for ignorance, rudeness or parsimony. The plea of a severe spirituality enables men oftentimes to treat God with a courtesy which would not be allowed in human society. 'Worship,' says Dr. Allon, 'has its beauty as well as its holiness and we must not make it repulsive under the pretence of making it devout. What special spirituality can there be in the pious doggerel of hymns, or the ruder incongruity of tunes? Why should it be necessary to abjure all culture and excoriate all taste in order that piety may have its supreme enjoyment? No genuine piety can excuse negligence. Everything pertaining to worship should surely indicate a reverent solicitude to bring to God the best we can proffer—an offering perfect in every appliance that can give emphasis to its adoration, intensify its rapture or, beautify its love.' 'Excess of material circumstance in spiritual worship, whether of architectural ornament, ritual ceremony, musical elaborateness, or even intellectual fastidiousness, is as injurious to it as is overcumbrous machinery in manufactories, excess of ceremonial in social life, superfluous raiment to personal activity, or gaudy ornamentation to personal grace. But equally so on

---

\*Krauth, MS. Lectures on Worship.

the other hand, is penuriousness and nakedness. If we may not overlay spiritual life, neither may we denude it.''\*

That which must regulate worship founded on Scripture is edification. This is after all the test. That which tends to build up the religious life with God and man best, this will be the best and highest form of worship. Whether it have much or little form it will foster spirituality. Here is the sphere of Christian liberty, a liberty which is not license, rather the liberty conforming itself to the great thought of worship,—communion with the Lord and communion of his members with each other to edification.

Christian worship was founded by the Lord Jesus Christ. He gave the following elements:

1. Assembly in his name. Matt. 18 : 20.
2. Prayer in his name. John 16 : 23, 24.
3. Common prayer. Matt. 18 : 19.
4. A form of prayer. Matt. 6 : 9-13.
5. The Holy Supper was instituted and its observance commanded. Matt. 26.
6. The office of the ministry of teaching the gospel and administering the sacraments was established. Matt. 28 : 18; 18 : 18; Luke 24 : 47, 48; John 15 : 27; 20 : 21-23.
7. The use of the Holy Scriptures was enjoined. John 5 : 39; 8 : 31; Luke 16 : 31; Matt. 4 : 4-10.†

He did not give Christian worship in completeness, but establishing these primal features permitted it to be developed by the Holy Spirit dwelling in the Church. The Church of Christ is divine and therefore it has a divine growth. There can be no question but that the worship of the early Christians was at the first largely influenced by the worship of the synagogue and to a certain extent modeled after it. It differed, however, both in principle and import and had from the beginning new features. These marked differences are noted in Acts 2 : 42, where it is said, "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship and in breaking of bread and in prayers."

---

\*Rowland, "The Worship of the Ch.," Bapt. Rev., 1883.

†Consult Horn's Handbook of Liturgies. Harnack in Theologischen Wissenschaften.

Under the leadership of the apostles there was gradual development of public worship, Dr. Schaff enumerates the following parts of public service under the apostles:

1. "The preaching of the Gospel. This was missionary in its character."

2. "The reading of Scripture with practical exposition and application. The lessons were from the Old Testament (Parashioth and Hepttaroth) transferred from the synagogue: later from the gospels and epistles, the latter sometimes serving as sermons."

3. "Prayer in various forms of petition, intercession and thanksgiving, (1 Tim. 2 : 1) likewise descended from Judaism. Prayer was made freely from the heart as they were moved by the spirit according to circumstances. There is no trace of a uniform and exclusive liturgy." Still he adds, "the frequent use of psalms and short forms of devotion, as the Lord's Prayer, may be inferred with certainty from the Jewish custom, from the Lord's direction concerning his model prayer, from the strong sense of fellowship among the first Christians and finally from the liturgical spirit of the ancients, which could not have so generally prevailed both in the East and the West without some apostolic or post-apostolic precedent."

4. "The song, a form of prayer in the festive dress of poetry and the elevated language of inspiration. The Lord himself inaugurated psalmody into the new covenant at the institution of the Holy Supper, and St. Paul enjoins the singing of 'psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.' But to this precious inheritance from the past, the Church in the enthusiasm of her first love, added original, specifically Christian psalms, hymns, doxologies and benedictions which afforded the richest material for sacred poetry and music in succeeding centuries; the song of the heavenly host for example, at the birth of the Saviour: the 'Nunc Dimittis' of Simeon; the 'Magnificat' of the Virgin; the 'Benedictus' of Zacharias; the thanksgiving of Peter at his deliverance; the fragments of hymns scattered through the Epistles; and the lyrical and liturgical passages, the doxologies and antiphones of the Apocalypse."

5. "*Confession of Faith.* The first express confession of

faith is the testimony of Peter that 'Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God.' The next is the trinitarian baptismal formula, out of this gradually grew the so-called Apostolic Creed."

#### 6. "Finally the administration of the Sacraments."

As we descend to the age which immediately succeeded the apostles, we have every reason to believe that there were fixed forms of worship. Time will not permit us to quote the evidence drawn from the Didache, or the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, from Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, the Apostolic Constitutions, the Ancient Liturgies, all indicating fixed forms of service and participation in worship by the people. There is a liturgy of the Apostolic and Early Church simple, but ample and sufficient. It has been contended with great strength that the best form of service is that of the second or third century, when the Church in her freedom under the guidance of the Holy Spirit had developed the elements of worship left by Christ himself.\*

After this period worship was unduly elaborated. False views concerning the priesthood, and sacrifice, expressed themselves in the service, worship was considered more and more as meritorious, a work of man before God which man offering to God thereby secured his favor.

Ceremonial and pomp intruded themselves, worship appealed to the senses and not to the intelligence and heart. The sermon dropped out, the selections of Scripture were in an unknown tongue, the Lord's Supper administered by a divine order, the priesthood, became a propitiatory sacrifice.†

The Reformation, both Reformed and Lutheran, necessarily dealt with this perversion of worship. At first the Reformed Churches retained a portion of the old order, and were decidedly liturgical.

But the Puritan, in his indignation against the abuses which had crept into public worship, threw out with the errors the

\*See Stapfer's Life in Palestine.

†Schoeberlein. Ueber den liturgischen Ausbau des Gemeinde gottes-dienstes.—*Höfling, Liturgisches Urkundenbuch.*

treasures of the past. Fanatically he relinquished part after part of the service till little was left but prayer and exhortation. "He showed the reach of his self-denial in respect to worship by putting away the public reading of the Scriptures as he showed the pathos of his self-denials by the burial of his dead in silence —his protest against the burial service of the Established Church."

It was remarkable how far this was carried. How beautiful is this collect. "Lord of all power and might, who art the author and giver of all good things: Graft in our hearts the love of thy name, increase in us true religion, nourish us with all goodness, and of thy great mercy keep us in the same; through Jesus Christ." It was this which provoked Jenny Geddes to cast her stool at the Dean of Edinburgh's head; she intelligently regarding these precious words as popish. Her words are historical: "The Diel colic thee in thy wame! Dost thou say mass at my lug?" The intensity of religious conviction and abhorrence of papistic evils enabled the Puritans to endure a worship that was shorn of all connection with the historical past. His descendants impressed that baldness of service on this land of ours and their ideas still control multitudes and even members of churches with a past of richer worship. It is hard, however, to be told that fixed forms of service are unspiritual because of this repugnance when the post-apostolic Church and all the Church in all ages has worshiped God under fixed forms. There is true worship, it may be justly conceded, without a fixed form of service, but in fact the elements of a liturgy are in every church. The baldest service may have its fixed form, oftentimes as harassing to the soul as iron fetters upon the limbs. It often reduces itself to hymn, prayer, reading of the Scriptures, the sermon, and the benediction. The hymns are fixed and not infrequently poor and egotistic, man more than God the centre; a light, frivolous ditty displaces devout and majestic music; the prayers are formal to such an extent that after hearing a minister a number of times, it is easy to know his method and the sequence of his petitions. So meagre and weak oftentimes are the petitions that the soul of the worshiping believer does not find them the upbearing wings to bear it reverently in ador-

ation and supplication to the throne of God. The human and the earthly conceal the divine and the heavenly.

The scripture-lessons and the sermons are intensely individualistic, the minister apparently oblivious to the fact that he is set apart from the congregation to conduct its worship and to bring to them the fulness of the gospel.

There are fixed forms which become formalistic by the method of use, but formalism is as easy to what is called the simple gospel as to the fixed service. That which tests both is edification, the building up in faith and life of the congregation.

Dr. Rowland, of the Baptists, wisely says: "For both individuals and churches there is but one valid law; namely, that as far as practicable each shall embody its own worship in such modes and forms as are best adapted to its own life. Of worship itself there is but one great use and end that it brings a brotherhood of men to the feet and heart of the Great Father in heaven, there to speak to the eager sympathy of his love all their adoration and all their desire."

The Lutheran Church would not cast away the treasures of the past. It purified the service, Luther declaring that the old service must be the basis of the new. He retained all that was directly from the word of God. He retained those portions which breathed the spirit of God's word, as the Gloria Patri, the Gloria in Excelsis, the creeds and the like. He rejected whatever was not in accordance with God's word. Agreement with the Scriptures and edification were the tests applied. The Lutheran Church purified the service even as it had reformed the teachings of the Church, preserving truth, eliminating errors.

The Lutheran church teaches that there are two factors in public worship, the divine factor, the human factor.

Worship is two-sided, that which men bring to God, and that which God imparts to men. Melanchthon in the Apology 253, says, "Theologians are rightly accustomed to distinguish between sacrament and sacrifice. A sacrament is a ceremony or work in which God imparts to us (*nobis exhibit*) that thing which the promise annexed to the ceremony offers (*offert*). As for example baptism is a work in which we do not offer to God, but in which God baptizes us, to wit, the minister in God's

place (*vice dei*) and God offers (*offert*) and imparts (*exhibits*) remission of sins, according to the promise he that believeth and is baptized is saved. On the contrary a sacrifice is a ceremony or work which we render to God that we may give him honor. The direct species of sacrifice are two only. The first is propitiatory sacrifice, that is a work with which satisfaction is made for sin and penalty, meriting for others the remission of sins; the other species is the eucharistic sacrifice which does not merit remission of sins or reconciliation, but is offered by those who are reconciled so that we render thanks for the remission of sins and other benefits received. In very deed there has been but one propitiatory sacrifice in the world to wit: The death of Christ. The rest are eucharistic sacrifices which are called sacrifices of praise, preaching of the gospel, faith, invocation, giving of thanks, confession, afflictions of the saints, nay all the good works of the saints."

Out of this has come in the treatment of public worship the designations of sacramental and sacrificial elements, meaning thereby that the sacramental element is that portion of worship where God offers through the word and the sacraments the blessings of salvation, that the sacrificial element is that portion of worship where man offers something to God, in prayer and praise. Only as these two elements reciprocally appear have we the truest worship.

Some have objected to these terms, but none have been found which are as satisfactory. The words, it is claimed, have a Romish tendency, but this must be proven and not simply asserted. The Lutheran has never taught that public worship is a means of grace; it is a means, through which the means of grace, word and sacrament are brought to men. Rome says the public service is an institution appointed by God directly conditioning salvation. The Lutheran Church says public worship in itself does not convey the forgiveness of sins and the blessings of salvation. These are found only in the gracious assurances of the Gospel, which must be appropriated by faith. It insists on public worship, because in it the Holy Spirit comes to men as the word and the sacraments are administered; and that men, in turn, through the Holy Spirit attending word and sa-

craments, receive what the Holy Spirit offers. Romish worship crowds out the sacramental by the sacrificial, and this the propitiatory sacrificial. The mass is a sacrifice of expiation. The word is in an unknown tongue.\*

Further, the Lutheran Church teaches that public worship should harmonize with the confession of faith of those who employ it. Every religion has developed its own distinctive worship as it has had distinctive being. Just so far as it has had deep distinctive religious ideas, has it had a distinctive form of worship. A Christian cannot worship like a Jew, or a heathen, because he is no heathen or Jew. The religious ideas peculiar to him will find expression in public worship and separate him from the Jew or the heathen.

"Christian worship can borrow nothing from the most exquisite forms in which purely pagan ideas were embodied. So far indeed as paganism involves the generic idea which makes religion religion, it is worthy of Christian study. There is a sense in which Christ is the end of the pagan system as he is of the Jewish. Paganism was the instinctive struggle; Judaism the divinely-guided one, and Christ is the fulfilling of what is truly human and truly divine in both. Whatever is distinctive of either system apart from the great generic character, Christianity must reject; to accept it would make it pagan or Jewish. Hence its churches cannot be reared on pagan models nor its art be shaped by distinctively pagan ideas. Neither is Christian worship to be an imitation or echo of the Jewish. The Church of Rome has sinned grievously in respect to her conformity to pagan and Jewish ideas. The traveler who visits Rome sees there the links not broken and hardly covered which unite at many points the worship of pagan Rome with that of papal Rome. The battle of the Reformation, so far as it turned upon worship, was directed mainly against the Judaizing principles and practice of the Church of Rome."

It should however be remembered that "the Jewish worship, embodying as it does great ideas divinely given, common to all time, is in this sphere rich in suggestions even to the Christian mind. Much of the Old Testament does not die in the New,

---

\*Cf. Jacob's, "Lutheran Movement in England," Chap. on Service.

but is transfigured in it. David's Psalms mean more to us than they meant to David."

A true worship must therefore be Christian over against all other religions, and equally it must be catholic and not sectarian. It will therefore be in harmony with the worship of the Apostolic Church which was divinely guided and in which were all the principles of Christian worship. There must be in it that which will appeal to believers in all times and place, and will conform to the Scriptures, but it must not be understood that it must mechanically conform to the apostolic worship. There is a principle of growth in the Church, and the Church is not bound in matters indifferent to the apostolic usage. As she has developed in her freedom her doctrines, even so she has developed her worship. And as her doctrines are conditioned by their agreement with Scripture, even so her worship may alone be conditioned by the same. An order of public worship will therefore arise out of the past. It will be the living growth of the Christian communion. Orders of public worship have indeed been made to order by able and pious men, but they are never satisfactory. They are individualistic and not catholic, the dust of the study is upon them and not the rich breath of the life of the Church wrought by the Spirit of God. The dry bones will not live.

It, however, must not be forgotten that there will be differences in worship according to the doctrines which are taught. The Protestant cannot be satisfied with the Romish mode of worship full of errors, nor can the Lutheran whilst holding much in common, be contented with those portions of worship where the Calvinist ignores or denies his faith.

As an interesting example how the public worship is influenced by doctrine we quote the following from Luckock's Divine Liturgy: "One sentence placed in the forefront of the Lutheran confession of sins was discarded by the revisers of the Prayer Book as doctrinally uncatholic and practically injurious; it was this: 'We acknowledge and we lament that we are conceived and born in sins, and that therefore we be prone to all evils and abhor from all good things.' What the faithful are called to grieve over is not original but actual sin. The guilt of

that nature which we received from Adam has been wiped out in baptism and in preparation for the reception of the sacrament we must be very careful not to ignore or deprecate the blessing of another, lest we mar this proportion of the catholic doctrine."

He further adds, "Again such a confession must prove harmful in practice, for to bring into prominence the depravity of our fallen nature, is to plead some justification or extenuation of our sins, which robs the confession at once of its true value. The language of the really contrite penitent is altogether different; 'we have done amiss and are without excuse.' "

It is readily seen that the Lutheran conception of sin, so deep and searching, is ignored in the Episcopal Confession. The Reformers taught that original sin is forgiven the baptized believer, but it remains as tendency to sin, wherefore the old Adam must be destroyed by daily repentance. It confesses not alone actual sin but that by nature we are sinful and unclean. The confession of sin in the Washington Liturgy, beautiful in language and true concerning actual sins, is faulty in this that derived from the Episcopal Liturgy it does not fully set forth the Lutheran idea of sin. It is true as far as it goes, but it is not as comprehensive and profound as our Lutheran doctrine.

Again it is noteworthy that the Lutheran Liturgies generally place the repetition of the Nicene Creed before the Communion. Luther retained it and in 1524 gave it to the people in versified form that they might sing it during the service. This is in strict accord with the Lutheran teaching of the Lord's Supper, which sets forth the divine nature of him who is truly present in the sacrament. The Apostles' Creed is not so explicit concerning the divinity of our Lord and is oft repeated by those who deny his divine nature. The Nicene Creed clearly sets forth him who is the only begotten Son, God of God, Light of Light, and thus prepares the worshiper to commune with him.

Liturgies have doctrinal significance. They are bulwarks for the truth, full and comprehensive in their statement of the truth, wherever they have arisen in conformity to the word of God out of the life of the Church. The danger doctrinally from such a liturgy is infinitesimal, though there are those who claim

that where the substance and order of worship is left to the caprice of the minister, who may be orthodox or not, the danger is less. Exposed as we are to false teaching in the homiletical part of the worship, it is well in the liturgical part; strictly so-called, that everything should not be left to the minister, but that in worship at least the congregation should set forth fully and truly their faith.

True worship should adapt itself within due limits to the national life. There are certain essential forms which are common to all nations because there is a common humanity. "If there are artificial perversions in national life which make it incompatible with these great elementary principles, Christianity must in so far break down that life and make it capable of the necessary adaptation." Holding fast to this there will nevertheless be adaptation to the nation and the times. The human element in the service will be adjusted to the life of the people. Rome has sinned grievously in this direction in that she has demanded an inflexible mode of worship in one tongue, and that a dead tongue, the Latin.

Luther was very careful in this matter. With delicate perception and judgment he retained some of the old Latin hymns, with their music, but he did not think, as a rule, the old Latin chants were adapted to the German language. "I would," he writes in 1524, "gladly have a church-service entirely in German, and I am laboring for that purpose, but then it must be thoroughly and consistently German. The literal translation of the Latin text into German and the singing of the old Latin tunes is not in good taste nor is it right. The words, the note, the accent, the mode, the movement, must all come out of the right mother's speech and voice, otherwise it is a mere imitation, such as monkeys make."

One of his old biographers says of him, that—"One time he came into the church at Eisenberg on Easter day and they were singing the Introit in German with the old Latin tune; whereupon he turned up his nose and looked very sour. When he returned to the inn to dine, the landlord asked him what had been the matter with him in church? 'I thought,' he said, 'I could have spit upon their ridiculous singing. If they wish to

sing in German, then let them sing good German hymns and tunes; and if they wish to sing the old Latin chants, then let them retain the old Latin text for which they were made, as scholars ought to do. I hate people who are making these little puny innovations. In the Latin schools, let them sing the Latin text and tunes; and in the German churches, let them sing German words and music; then all goes right."

Our own experience as an English church with some of the German hymns and music has been unsatisfactory. They are not adapted to our life. Only as hymns rise above the national and are universal, can they be handed from nation to nation. And Luther shows his good sense here. "Most of the singing of the mass is very fine and glorious, breathing nothing but thankfulness and praise, such as the 'Gloria in Excelsis, the Hallelujah, the Sanctus, the Benedictus, the Agnus Dei'. In these you will find nothing of the superstition of the sacrifice, but only praise and thanksgiving. Especially the Agnus Dei, above all hymns, is appropriate to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; for it clearly sings and praises Christ that he hath borne our sins; and it lovingly and powerfully brings up the memory of Christ in few and beautiful words."

The Lutheran Church has cared for this principle of adaptation. It guarded jealously the freedom of worship. It enriched the service by adding to the best of the past, its own hymns. "Germany has seen many vicissitudes since the tramp of battle was in her streets. The paralysis of heresy has fallen upon her churches, revolutions have overturned her thrones and storms swept over her homes, but her hymns have remained an abiding inheritance; a creed and a ritual indelibly written upon the hearts of the people, the incense of her domestic altars, the watchword of her champions, the solace of her manly hearts. Many a hero have they inspired in patriotic battle, many a saint when the shadows of death have dimmed his eye and caused his tongue to falter and his grasp to relax. The songs of men's soul, they abide still, fresh and real and beauti-

ful, and they will abide while heart answers to heart or God's truth speaks to it."\*

The Lutheran Church of the sixteenth century retained those great essential parts which the Church has found to best express the needs of our common Christianity. She would not deprive her people of the common heritage nor despise the work of the Holy Spirit in the ages past. The unity of the Church was dear and preferable far to the morbid individualism characteristic of later days. Therefore diverse as are the nationalities which the Lutheran Church embraces, they conform to the same general form of worship wherever that faith and worship are rightly understood.

In their recent valuable work on Christian worship, Profs. Richard and Painter conclude by reference to this principle of national adaptation, and speak of the worship which the American life will produce and rather give their verdict against the present liturgical forms of worship in the Lutheran Church as too elaborate. It is too soon to predict what the renewed consideration of worship will produce. The American people educated, given to brevity, gifted with aesthetic taste, will in their forms of worship in all probability incline to liturgical forms which are brief, comprehensive, beautiful, full of the Holy Ghost.

As the authors themselves have pointed out, the tendency is toward liturgical forms. The force of the bald and bare Puritanical worship has spent itself and there is a demand that everything be no longer left to the minister and the choir, but that the congregation audibly participate. And this means a return to the treasures of prayer and praise in the Church, the slow accumulation of the centuries.

Whatever may be the result in our general American Christianity, it is reasonably certain that a genuine American Lutheranism will conform itself closely to the fixed forms of the worship which grew out of the doctrines of the Lutheran Church and express its truth, faith and life. Eventually there may be modifications adapting it to certain phases and needs of the national life of this people, but it will remain faithful in es-

---

\*All on Hymns.

sentials. There may be some who have been trained otherwise, to whom all fixed forms are distasteful, who may not agree with this position, but such appears to be the movement of the Church. Conscientious in their opposition and true to the doctrine of the Church, they are to be respected. But there is another class to whom no such respect can be accorded. There are errorists who intensely dislike fixed forms because they express the doctrines of the Church which they do not receive. This is strikingly manifested by Harnack and his followers who desire to excise the Apostles' Creed from the liturgical forms of the Church, as they no longer subscribe to the saving doctrines and historical facts of our common Christianity.

In the present condition of religious life the wisest course apparently is to adopt and use our own Lutheran service with such modifications as peculiar surroundings may demand and through its use come at last to the ideal national service for the Church.

For a proper understanding of public worship it is necessary to consider for a moment the relation of the ministry to the congregation. The universal priesthood of believers forbids the teaching of Rome, that there is a divinely commissioned order through whom alone the believer can come to God in public worship; that the priest alone can present the prayers and praises of the congregation and becomes the mediator of the grace of God through prayer and the sacraments.

We teach that the ministry is a divinely instituted office. He is called of God to this office, which call is mediated by the Church. The minister is one selected out of the Church and called and ordained by the Church to the ministry of preaching, to administer the sacraments and to conduct their worship decently and in order. Protestantism acknowledges merely the official fitness of the clergy to conduct worship. On the one hand, called of God the minister represents God as his ambassador, officially speaking and acting for God. On the other hand he represents the congregation to lead them in their worship.

As such the minister should realize that he is to represent the congregation and conduct their worship not according to indi-

vidual fancies but according to the needs of the congregation. He may not officiate in an unknown tongue. He may not assume the portion of the service that belongs to the congregation. He may not arbitrarily change their worship.\*

The worship must be in truth. They that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth. The audible word the preaching of the Gospel must be understood by the hearer so that he may intelligently and devoutly draw near to God, and in the visible word, the sacrament, the believer must actually participate.

The demand is therefore that in everything the ministry must provide a true and proper use of God's word. Where there is freedom to the minister as in preaching, it must conform to the Scripture. Preaching is not all of worship, it is a chief part alone; when it is legitimately drawn out of God's word. A great deal of preaching is neither worship nor gospel.

God's word appears sacramentally chiefly in the Scripture readings, the Sermon, the Absolution and Benediction. The Scripture lessons may be free, chosen by the pastor, but they are presented to us by the Church through the Scripture lessons adapted to the Church Year. These lessons are not faultless but they stand for the judgment of the Church as containing the essence of the word, a hindrance to that excessive individualism which too often presents a fragmentary conception of the truth to the people.

The general Church must not deprive the local congregation of liberty, but on the other hand, the local congregation is bound to conform to the principles of the general Church. The local congregation may not interpret Scripture as it pleases, or change the creed, neither has it a right to define for itself its own worship. It has a relation to the general Church. It is not an independent entity. There is a communion of the saints. There is a law of liberty in worship as well as in duty. There is a fellowship in worship which should be observed as well as fellowship in doctrine. A congregation is not the sole source of authority, or wisdom

---

\**Christian Worship*, Richard and Painter.

It is on this principle that the advocates of the Church Year declare that the general Church is better adapted to select the Scripture lessons than the individual congregation.

It is sometimes urged that the use of the Church Year is opposed to true freedom and destructive of spirituality. It is true that where it is used mechanically and formally this is the result, but this is equally characteristic of the individual use of the Bible, which will also depend upon the spirit in which it is used.

The Church Year is based upon the life and person of Christ. It sets him forth not in snatches and fragments but in fulness. The minister who follows the Church Year wisely will bring before the congregation the complete work and life of Christ. Merriam, a Congregationalist says, "Christianity both as a creed and as a life depends absolutely upon the personal character of the founder. As the chief attack of criticism (and so necessarily upon theology and upon the actual Christian life) is more and more concentrated upon the story of the Gospels and upon the Divine Man therein set forth, such an annual following of that life in study, worship and practical application to our own conduct as the felicitous ordering of the Church Year affords, becomes more attractive and useful. It tends to fix attention on that which is simple, primary and essential to the faith. It incites personal affection and loyalty to Jesus and lifts him up as an example and inspiration in daily conduct. In this way the Church Year tends to bring Christians out of the abstractions of theory and opinion into the region of life."\*

In all this it is not to be understood that Christ is not savagely set forth where there is no observance of the Church Year. He has been truly set forth and is now without such observance, but in how many cases in a hapless fashion. Some of the great features of Christ's work and life are ignored or overlooked. The Scriptures are used in the most arbitrary and capricious manner. The preaching is desultory, sensational, incomplete. Or the dogmatic side of Christianity is overworked and the pulpit becomes the arena for theological subtleties. In Germany I was much impressed by the sermons drawn from the gospels of the Church Year. They were in touch with Christ,

---

\*Merriam, *Andover Review*, "Use of the Church Year."

and therefore practical and spiritual. In Heidelberg an advanced theologian in handling the gospel for the day because he followed it in an expository way brought his congregation face to face with the divine Christ in strong helpfulness.

The worth of the Church year is great to those who devoutly follow it—Advent, Incarnation, Epiphany, the temptation, the preparation for the cross, the Holy Week, Good Friday, Easter, the forty days, Ascension, Whitsunday, Trinity, here are the great themes to set forth Christ, the great redemption, the glorious promises, the Church, the Holy Spirit, the deep mystery of the Godhead; whilst the Sundays after Trinity cover the Christian life in its fulness. It can only be appreciated when it is followed in devout and humble fidelity to present a complete and not a partial Christ to the people, a complete and not a partial Christian life to the believer.

Above all let it be remembered that with the liberty that belongs to the preacher, it serves him as guide and is not a tyrant. He can vary with judgment, following the spirit of the Church Year. There will arise circumstances which will justify him in his leading of the congregation to deal with other topics and themes. If the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath, even so the Church in these selections meant this order to be followed for the edification of her members and as a guide to her ministry, but does not desire her members and ministry to be slaves to this order.

Through the sermon, the ministry as ambassadors in the name and place of God, offer God's grace to the congregation. As a Church, we have ever regarded it as of the highest importance. Luther said: "Where God's word is not preached, it were better that there were not singing, or reading, or assembly. The greatest and the principal part of the worship of God is the preaching and teaching of God's word." He did not mean by this that the other portions of worship were not of the highest importance, as his Formula Missae well shows, but it was his indignant protest against that worship which had ignored the preaching of the word.

In the sermon there will always be the personality of the minister, though influenced by the churchly faith and conversa-

tion of the people of God. It will be the utterance of his personal experience. It is this which gives peculiarity to the preacher and influence over men, but that is alone a true sermon where these gifts are subjected in humble submission to God, and where the Scriptures are the quickening soul and directing norm of the sermon. The sermon will thus declare God's forgiveness to men and bestow upon them his grace.

There must also be the administration of the Lord's Supper in which we are united to the Lord Jesus, the holy and blessed sacrament of his body and blood. It is with the word of God the means whereby God imparts his grace to us in Christian worship.

It must be observed as he commanded it. There must be the consecration or words of the institution, the distribution and the reception. Here in every age where worship has been true, the Christian congregation finds supreme nearness to the Lord, enjoys his comfort and receives his life, and therefore concludes with it the service in order that the believer may depart with joy and thanksgiving from the house of God.

On the other hand the sacrificial acts in worship are through confession, praise, and prayer. It will be impossible to treat of all these, of the value of the creeds in worship, of the Introits, the formula solennes, the church-hymns, as time forbids.

We will but consider prayer which is so prominent in all worship. Our whole life ought to be a continual prayer, but that devotion may be strengthened and fellowship with God be living, prayer must be expressed. Consciousness of guilt will cause man to confess his sin and ask for forgiveness, consciousness of forgiveness and of the received grace of God will be expressed in thanks and praises to him, whilst his needs within and without will ever move him to supplication and intercession. The believer will show forth his faith in words of prayer. As he belongs to the congregation, such prayer will be common, even as Christ enjoined. Prayer must be true, from the heart, in the name of Christ and with filial confidence. By these last is it distinguished from the prayers of other religions. The prayer of the Christian is the prayer of a child of God, justified by faith in Christ Jesus.

Should prayer be free, or written? Ought not the believer to approach God, speaking freely out of need, seeking guidance from the Holy Spirit? Are not the formal prayers of the service, the confession of sins, the collects, the general prayers detrimental to spirituality, fetters upon the free spirit? There are those who honestly believe this.

It ought not to be overlooked that the public prayer is the prayer of the congregation and the minister the mouth-piece of the congregation. In free prayer they are helplessly in the power of the minister. The sole security lies in the good sense, good taste and devout feeling of the minister. It is true that by the help of an unwritten liturgy, and a canon of unwritten law in the methods and mode of prayer that the minister generally fairly fulfils his duties. But how often does prayer fail, because of the peculiarities, self-seeking and thoughtlessness and even lack of spirituality in the minister. Prayer is an opportunity to display the man. "He delivered an eloquent and impressive prayer." "The most eloquent prayer ever addressed to a Boston audience." What an incongruity to speak thus of prayer and what a criticism on the officiant!

Boyd of Scotland says: "How often has every one been annoyed by the minister in prayer, giving information to the Lord, or using it as a means of reproof, or an opportunity to air the speakers views, or to estimate his opponents.

Thus prayer as information: 'Bless each one of the 1345 communicants who received the sacrament last Sunday under this roof.'

As reproof: 'Have mercy on them who present trifling excuses which would not for a moment be suffered to detain them from any engagement of business, or of amusement, to keep them away from the places where God has recorded his name and promised to meet with his people.'

As expressive of the speakers views: 'Lord have mercy upon the magistrates of Drumsleekie such as they are, make them wiser and better.'

As estimate of opponents: 'Lord, have mercy upon that miserable man who was lately pouring forth blasphemies against thee' The blasphemy consisted of declaring that there was no

harm in taking a walk in a Botanic Garden on the Lord's Day. Some are hard to classify, as in an extempore marriage service, the prayer had the following: 'We thank thee that thou hast given us wumman to make us koumfortable.'"

Prayer is to be edifying, building up the faith of the congregation by expressing their wants and thanksgivings unto God reverently, fully and helpfully. A provided form will do this as adequately as free prayer and oft better. The truth is that "as certain as two and two make four," as Dr. Boyd, a Presbyterian says, "that so far as concerns the congregation public prayer is always of necessity a provided form. It is never the extemporaneous, or free prayer of the congregation: it is a form provided and imposed upon them by the officiating minister. The congregation cannot even (as with a prayer-book) look at the service beforehand and resolve whether it be such as they can, in conscience, in feeling, in good taste join in and accept as their own. Nobody knows what the form is until it is actually produced; not even the man who is to produce it. Often from sentence to sentence he is groping his way. Often he knows not what is to come next. Often he feels deeply that he has not said what he desired and wishes he could withdraw, or amend the words. *That is to say and By which I mean,* Principal Tulloch told me, were words familiar to him in the prayers of a fine old Professor of the University, in his youth.

The question is not form, or no form. The only issue is, Shall the form be provided deliberately, calmly, with serious consideration and by the combined wisdom of a company of devout and earnest men? or shall it be provided in great haste, nervous trepidation and utter blankness, without a vestige of devotional feeling, by some youth without religious experience and quite unable to interpret and express the needs and feelings of good old Christian people tried in ways of which he knows nothing at all? Lord Campbell tells us that the morning he had first to pray in the Divinity Hall at St. Andrews, 'I heard the bell cease and my heart died within me.' Is that a fit mood in which to extemporize a form of prayer? We know, God be thanked, it is not always so. It is not even commonly so. The

form is provided by a good and experienced minister, well knowing the case of his congregation, tolerably free from nervousness, and with his memory stored with decorous sentences, the traditional liturgy of Scotland; he can hardly go wrong. Not merely upon the ministers spiritual frame, but upon the humblest details of his physical nature, the congregation are helplessly dependent for their prayers. 'The Spirit is not in this place,' said an emotional Evangelist, preaching for good Dr. Craik of Glasgow; one of the best and most cultivated of Scotch ministers in his day. But Dr. Craik told me, with much indignation, 'I said to him after church that the Spirit would not be in any place if a man ate two pounds of beef-steak at breakfast that morning!' The statement was humbling; but it was true. A physical miracle need not be looked for."

The Lutheran Church has provided forms of prayer, but has not made them compulsory. She acknowledges both free and written prayer. There are times when the minister will be desirous to lead the devotion of his people in special needs. There is also provided in the general prayer a place for special petitions conveying desires which are not satisfied by the written prayers. There are thus direction and freedom. Personal experience has taught us the worth of this. There have been times when to extemporize a suitable prayer has seemed impossible, just as at other times it has been a delightful and unspeakable privilege. However, the best of free prayers do always lack the terse, full and complete character of those glorious prayers that the Church has crystallized out of her life, the result of devout communion with God, that glow, jewel-like, with the brilliant colors of faith and hope and love and praise and adoration.

The fundamental elements of Christian worship are in the service of the Lutheran Church, every portion being full of precious meaning, deep with the truth of God. The congregation first approach God with the confession. They humbly confess their sins and receive the declaration of grace in the gospel promises to the penitent and believing. Pardon, they are prepared out of grateful hearts to adore and praise God. The Glorias, the Gloria Patri and the Gloria in Excelsis, bound to-

gether by the Kyrie, pleading for mercy, exultantly rise. The Scriptures are then read in which God speaks through his word to his people, the Gospel tells of Christ the Saviour, and in the mighty consciousness of their trust and love, the congregation joyfully confess their glorious faith in the creed. The hymn is now sung and the sermon, to which all these have led, brings the message of Christ's minister to the people. The congregation then lay their offerings before the Lord, symbol of their consecration to him. The general prayer then follows, for the teaching should lead men to know God and themselves, and thus in fellowship with one another, in trusting faith, they are fitted to pray for all men, the Church of Christ and for every good. The communion follows. In lofty adoration and praise they draw near. The exhortation searches the heart. The words of the Master are heard; the tender words of love, the gracious command, with its wondrous promises, fall like music upon the believing heart.

The Lord's Prayer tells of the common filial relation to God the Father, the Agnus Dei so rich in the presentation of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, calls forth grateful and adoring love. Then follow the distribution, the thanksgiving, doxology and benediction. As Lutherans we have the most appropriate and beautiful communion service of all Christian churches, as is meet for those who hold the true and precious doctrine of the Lord in this most holy ordinance.

It is well therefore to prize our heritage. There are in it eternal riches. It is not perfect. Perhaps no service on earth ever will be. All our worship is affected by the sin of man and the presence of the world about him.

Worship must ever have its sad side because it must set forth the life of the Church whose silver is ever mixed with dross, its wine with water. It must have its glad side looking beyond this life to the true life of the Church as it should be and is to be. It confesses sins, it urges to sanctification and lays hold upon the glorification which shall be. It is the bond of earth and heaven, as has well been said. "The Church triumphant must lend part of her treasures to the church militant to help

her upward to the triumphant. Worship is a thing both of the cross and of the crown; it could not be without the bloody sweat in Gethsemane nor without the sceptre at the right hand of the Father. It needs the litany of the Church in the dust, and the Gloria in Excelsis which came down in its first words upon angel lips out of heaven. Nothing is so deep, nothing so high, nothing so sad, nothing so exultant as true worship. To go beneath it belongs only to the lost, to rise beyond it belongs not even to the angels and the glorified. It is heaven's supremest height perfectly to rise to it.\*

Therefore whilst in our worship here earthly infirmities remain, there is also in the true worship a heavenly ideal, which the exultant soul in its flight of adoration, praise and prayer can never pass beyond. Worship abides in the Church here, and will abide in the heavenly church, for there as here must God and man draw near each other in fellowship. And in the ages to come, that form of worship will abide in the Church where crystallized in her hymns and chants and psalms and prayers the child of God, believing, needy, loving, finds spirituality and truth wrought out by the struggles, sorrows, aspirations and victories of the children of God, who now in heaven worship before him who sitteth upon the throne and the Lamb forever and ever.

---

\*Krauth, MS. Lectures on Worship.

## ARTICLE II.

## THE SOURCE OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.

By DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D. D., Springfield, Ohio,

The incomparably great questions of life are those which relate to the existence, the character, the government and providence of God, and to man as made in God's image and considered as the creation of his power and the subject of his law. The questions which thus pertain to God and man and to the relationships existing between the two will appear as the supreme questions to every one who will properly consider them, as well as the questions of deepest and widest interest, confronting all men with an imperative summons to thought. It is accordingly the gravity of the questions and interests involved, which gives its vital consequence to the subject of this paper, which may be said to be the burning religious question of the times. "Truth," said an English philosopher, "is the most unbending and uncompliable, the most necessary, firm immutable and adamantine thing in the world. Of no sort of truth may this be as persistently affirmed as that which is distinctively religious." And notwithstanding the protracted assertion of notoriously objectionable hypotheses proclaimed to be "within the limits of liberty allowed to scholarship and opinion," it is a matter of the gravest importance whether the question regarding what is indisputable in religion, be answered after the fashion of Mr. James Martineau, the late gifted papal prelate John Henry Newman or of those who postulate an inspired authoritative record and a Divine Christ.

The free inquiry that had been developed in Europe in connection with the revival of learning could not be smothered by mere external authority, and hence it is not surprising that this principle in modern times has been weakened, and that the unreasoning docility and blind deference to ecclesiastical dominance which characterized the life of the middle ages have be-

come greatly limited, whether it be the tendency of a reactionary movement to swing to an opposite extreme or whatever may be the cause, certain it is that since the Protestants disallowed the functions claimed by the Church of Rome in the good fight of the reformation, there has been a growing and widespread aversion to authority and especially that of ecclesiasticism in matters of religion. It is an inadmissible assumption however that true Christianity is a set of doctrines arbitrarily demanding assent on merely external grounds and assertions of authority and that it coerces conviction and duty by the announcement of certain terrors and inexorable events. This is to mistake the entire genius of the religion of Christ. And it may be asserted as true, that in matters of religion the rejection of all authority outside of the individual is either a part and parcel of a philosophy which admits nothing but the objects of severe perception and identifies all religion with superstition, or that, in some way it is connected with an irreligious temper and springs out of it. In the matter under discussion there are two extremes. There is the merely external view that would rest everything on mere authority, giving no value to any proof but that of miracles and counting our judgments as to the truth and loftiness of doctrine as of no account. This is one of the extremes. The other is the rationalistic or mystical position that nothing is to be received except that which is discerned, understood and felt to be true. The right position—that which is apostolic in its character and which was reaffirmed at the reformation—is neither of these.

One of the theories regarding the origin of the reformation—that of Guizot,—asserts that it was an insurrection against authority. It was an effort, in his judgment, to deliver the human reason from the bonds of authority; "an insurrection of the human mind against the absolute power of the spiritual order." It was not an accident, the result of some casual circumstance nor simply an effort to purify the Church in which an Augustinian monk assailed certain practices of a Dominican. The comprehensive and most powerful cause was the dominant desire of the human mind for freedom. Free thought and inquiry are the legitimate product and the real intent of the movement.

Such is Guizot's interpretation. In entire harmony with this theory of the author of "Civilization in Europe," Romanists have always maintained that Luther's attack on the hierarchy in the sixteenth century broke up the foundations of faith in western Europe and that for this he deserves eternal infamy and perpetual maledictions. On the other hand there are those who reject the Christian revelation and deny all authority in the province of religious belief, who maintain that Luther's supreme merit consisted in that revolt against the authority of the pope which in the judgment of Romanists was his chief crime. The vindication of the right of private judgment is, in the opinion of such writers, the chief glory of Protestantism. Thus it comes that Catholic writers and supporters of free-thought are practically agreed in attributing to Luther and Protestantism a large measure of responsibility for that form of modern unbelief which is distrustful of everything supernatural. It has been maintained that free inquiry and revolt against authority were thus marks of the Reformation, and that therefore those who, as the result of the exercise of their right of private judgment in matters of religion, have lost their faith in Christianity, have a right to claim Luther as one of the great leaders in the movement which has terminated in their emancipation from all religious authority and thus abrogation of every species of supernaturalism.

It is however a gross perversion and an entire misrepresentation of the spirit of that epoch-marking movement to characterize the Reformation as a revolt against all authority in matters of religious belief and practice and a nullification of all standards in the matters pertaining to man's higher nature and thought. It was a revolt against an arrogant hierarchy which claimed to be the permanent incarnation of Christ, the body of the Lord, the organ of his Spirit, equally with Scripture, able to guide to God, and assuming to be alone able to determine what was the word of God. It was a rout of papal marplots, not in the name of freedom from all authority, but in the name of God. It was the assertion of an authority which was believed by devout and holy and learned men to be true against an authority which had been found false, arbitrary and unethi-

cal. It was not a struggle on behalf of the competency of the individual Christian man, without a revelation from God, to answer the most solemn and awful questions concerning himself, his duty and destiny, so much as a struggle for the competence and right of the individual Christian to recognize for himself the voice of God when God speaks, and to understand the divine meaning. It was not a revolt against authority so much as a revolt against usurpation, and was meant to assert the august and infinite claims of God to the faith, love, obedience and loyalty of all men. The kind of authority which was now claimed for the Scriptures was a very different thing from the authority which had been exercised since the days of the consolidation of the hierarchy. It was the authority of a father over his children rather than that of a master over his slaves. Faith and freedom were reconciled, for faith was the highest act of freedom and because the soul recognized for itself, in divine revelation, a divine majesty and glory, it yielded its obedience and its trust.

Let it be understood then that no right-thinking and moral man is eager to claim intellectual freedom to such an extent as to abrogate *all* authority. There is such a diversity among responsible agents who have not merely private and free spheres of their own, that their mutual relations in society must be determined externally, by some practicable standard of authority, held to be binding on all. It is indispensable, for example, in the state that men's responsibility to society and to their own moral and religious convictions, do not publicly clash, and accordingly statesmen are anxious to understand the grounds upon which public opinion and safety can permanently repose. Thus there is authority, and the question as to its source in religion is a living and most momentous question.

As to the source and seat of this authority there have been three answers, that of the Romanist who locates it in the Church, that of the rationalist who finds it in the reason, and that of the Protestant who traces it to the word of God as the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

1. We have first of all the answer of the Romanist for our consideration. That answer inheres in the papal conception of the Church and is in entire harmony with the genius of the

hierarchy. Catholic unity is limited to two things, (1) a recognition of the infallibility of the Church and consequently of all doctrines upon which that infallibility is known to be staked, that is, which have been unquestionably defined by its legitimate organ as a part of the deposit of faith, and therefore of universal obligation; and (2) acceptance of, and submission to, the supreme jurisdiction of the Roman See, and the authority, when lawfully exercised, of the local hierarchies that are in communion with it. It holds to a theory which affixes the attributes of unity, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity to the external, visible society of which the bishop of Rome is the chief, and declares that outside of this body there is no salvation; that the notes of the true Church belong to this society, and that accordingly the promises made in the New Testament to the Church, and the privileges there ascribed to it, are claimed for the hierarchy exclusively. The Church says Bellarmin, is something as tangible as the Republic of Venice. The difference—the primal difference—between Romanism and Protestantism—as has been admirably asserted by Luthardt, consists in opposite mental tendencies. “The opposite mental tendencies are sometimes designated as authority and liberty. Catholicism represents authority; Protestantism represents liberty. The former advocates legitimacy; the latter the rights of historical progress. The former says Protestant controversy is stagnation; the latter, says Romish controversy is the spirit of revolution, though revolution has ever had her seat in Romish lands.”

The papacy has identified with the original divine revelation, a certain body of opinions, which from an early period had been developed in the Latin church in order to maintain the economy of a certain ecclesiastical administration. It looks upon the episcopate as the continuation of the apostolate, in which, by virtue of succession, inhered the gifts or deposit of truth and grace and authority. It looks upon the Church as a consolidated body which finds in the pope as the vicar of Christ its head, mouth-piece and bond of unity. It regards the acceptance of a certain amount of information for which man has no inward aptitude in the reason, upon the authority of the

episcopate or the Church, as possessing the merit of evangelical faith. It stands for an episcopal hierarchy which has successively claimed the right to teach and govern the world in the place of Christ. Its system of doctrines have been constructed accordingly, in obedience to one test, viz., its fitness or adaptability for holding mankind in subjection to external authority, and as such it is confessedly a superb effort to make men realize their oneness through a vast piece of ecclesiasticism. We see plainly in the Latin church the old Roman genius for rule—the capacity and disposition to exercise authority characteristic of the great empire of the Cæsars.

This quality which Virgil attributes to his countrymen as a native trait, and which the growth of Roman power and its long duration illustrate, seems to have been transmitted to the Roman Church and its bishops. One of the very earliest extant Christian writings after the apostles—the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians—contains an admonition almost authoritative in its tone, addressed to them by the Roman Church in whose name Clement wrote. It was indicative of the Roman talent and spirit of rulership. The love of order, the will to check insubordination wherever deference and obedience are conceived of as obligatory, were tendencies of the Roman mind which have appeared in full vigor in the successive incumbents of the chair of St. Peter down to Leo X, and his troublesome subordinates the archbishop of New York, and Father McGlynn.

In entire accord with this old Roman genius the Church identified with the episcopate became a personification of deity, a mysterious entity entrusted with the divine gifts necessary for salvation. Accordingly it has always strenuously asserted that the Holy Spirit was tied in his action to the hierarchy and spoke only through its accredited representatives. The bishops came to be regarded as the sole depositaries of the Spirit's presence, and consequently there grew up in time a theory that the decisions of councils composed of bishops were given directly by the Holy Spirit, inasmuch as they were given by the voice of the united episcopate. Such was the theory first explicitly announced by Cyprian the famous Bishop of Carthage, who first distinctively taught the doctrine of the apostolic succession.

In his view the episcopate, which indeed constitutes the Church was conceived as an organic whole complete in itself, and everywhere diffused and endowed with the divine powers necessary for the salvation of men. Augustine unhesitatingly accepted the dictum of Cyprian, that outside of this Church there was no salvation—that the man who had not the Church for his cherishing mother could never have God as his father. Then there rose in his soul the idea that God was a being who intended to rule the world and did actually do so. In turn he concluded that to leave men to decide for themselves the great issues of their destiny was to leave God entirely out of the question. Then argued this master among the church fathers, and greatest dialectician of his time, that the Church was here by divine appointment, and that, if that were so, all men should come into it; that if they would not come of themselves they must be forced to come; and, that if the Church was deficient in the power to compel them, it was the sacred duty of the State due the Church, to come to its rescue, and by the power of the sword to compel them to come in that the Church might be filled and men's salvation secured.

Thus the conception of the Church became more and more that of a vast, pervasive, mysterious entity, a living corporate existence endowed with all the powers, the supernatural gifts and grace for the salvation of men. The grace by which men were saved was deposited primarily not in the congregation, but in the bishops by whom it was administered unto the people. Thus gradually the Church came to take the place of Christ as the way of redemption and had unsurped the place of the divine Mediator between God and man. And thus can one readily see how that, with this view of the Church as an institution founded on earth by Christ, the government of which had been entrusted after his departure to the pope as his vicar, it would be incongruous at least to think of the Holy Spirit as a diffused spiritual activity not bound to the hierarchy or confined within the ecclesiastical organization.

The teaching of the Church concerning the Scriptures follows from all this as a logical sequence. The Christian religion, it says, would have prevailed without the Scriptures, but it could

not have prevailed without the organism known as the Church, for the Church is its historic and objective form, its divinely constituted organism. The faithful are not contemplated in isolation as individual souls, but as the members of one body, of a household and a sheep-fold which is the Church. Holy Scripture is not addressed to individuals separate from this family and with a view to uniting them into a body of Christ, but to believers who are in communion with the family, and have accepted its authority and acknowledged the duty of obedience to whatever it teaches. As in the national order the written constitution is evolved from the organic life of the nation, so Scripture grows out of the organic life of the Church, and supposes the Church to be the historic embodiment of the life and work of Christ. Any attempt to separate Scripture from the Church and make of it an independent authority must prove disastrous. The Church is the sole fountain of the meaning of Scripture as well as the sole exponent of God's word as contained in Scripture or in its own consciousness as the collective individual enduring without succession—receiving the divine word from the lips of the Master and declaring it to men. Scripture serves to preserve the spirit and truth of Christ only in its original and permanent relationship to the Church. If the Scripture be regarded as independent of the Church then the critical faculty of the individual will inquire whether or not all the writings are God's. He may satisfy himself as to their authenticity but will find no argument that will show that they are inspired, and consequently God's word. Scripture does not testify to its own inspiration, nor would its testimony be conclusive, for the inspiration of such texts themselves would have to be established before the fact of a general inspiration could be believed. Accordingly all these matters must be handed over entirely to the Church whose function it is to determine what is Scripture and impart its meaning to mankind.

Thus the Bible which is the disclosure of Christ, is possessed according to this papal ecclesiastical legerdemain, of no self-authenticating power and can only be safely interpreted by the Church, by a prelate or body of prelates who are authorized to interpret with infallible correctness what our Lord and his ap-

ties taught with a simplicity and clearness unsurpassed. The leaders of the papacy forecast the conflict of truth against error, and knowing that the revolt against ecclesiastical authority would be increased by the direct access to the Scriptures, the influential Council of Toulouse in 1229,—seventeen years after the decree of the dogma that the bread and wine in the eucharist were miraculously transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ—in order to extirpate the growing heresy, declared it a sin for the laity to be found in possession of the Bible, or to read even the Psalter or the Breviary in the vernacular. From that day to this the hierarchy has cultivated and scattered broadcast the wrath and bitterness which are the worst fruits of schism, by her denunciation of all who have not acknowledged her authority as above the authority of God speaking in the Holy Scriptures. The function of the Church is purely ministerial and declarative. She has no right to make any new law to bind men's consciences, and that spirit of intolerance which manifests itself in the presumptuous and inconsistent exaltation of one's own sect into *the* Church and the denial of the validity of all sacraments which are not administered according to its orders, or the persecution which was the outcome of the Puritan dream of a visible church on earth composed only of the elect and regenerated, or the anathemas of the council of Trent applied to the rejection of more than three hundred points of belief—that spirit is Romish and revolting in its usurpation of the divine prerogatives.

Thus then have we come to see the process by which Rome comes to assert as authoritative, that what the Church says through her supreme representative the Holy Ghost says. If an ecclesiastical council has been regularly convoked and has legitimately come to its decisions, and if its decisions have been confirmed by the supreme head of the Church—the pope—then the decision is truth and has been spoken by the Holy Spirit. A Christian's duty accordingly is obedience to the Church and his greatest sin disobedience to its authority. The root of all sin, indeed the chiefest among sins is to desire to know anything religious apart from the declarations of the Church. The individual has no rights, no Christian independence, no independent

conviction of truth, no individual assurance of divine grace, no private appeal to the word of God, apart from the Church and the lordly assumptions of its chief bishop—the Pope of Rome.

And now it is not a little remarkable to note the peculiar fascination this source of authority located in the Church has had for some whose yearnings have become histories and whose love of truth was sincere and earnest, but who, realizing that they only knew in part, have been ready to welcome a guide that promised to bring them to intellectual and religious restfulness. They have felt with a peculiar force the urgency of the inevitable questions: "How shall I know the truth?" "By what test shall I separate it from error?" "How shall I be assured that my search is not in vain?" The religious interests and questions overshadow all others. There have been opposing faiths and irreconcilable contradictions; and there has come to many a thoughtful man an irrepressible yearning for some fixed and abiding standard by which unchanging truth may be distinguished from human errors. And this yearning has sometimes been connected with a singular mental phenomenon, viz., that those who have asserted the extremest use of reason and exhausted all their praise of a liberal Christianity, have, at last, deserted their old allies and found a resting place in a great piece of traditional ecclesiasticism which is at once illiberal and a constraint upon reason. This craving of the soul for a rod and staff upon which it can lean has been described in words which are alike beautiful and tender by the gifted author of "The Theistic Argument."\* Romanism is both logical and

\*"Some may be led by selfish motives, to identify themselves with a church that has with it respectability and dignity and weight of years; some, doubtless, are attracted by mere outward trappings, by the pomp and ceremonial that ages have silvered o'er with a solemn grandeur; some, even by the small social pride of seeming to be select and different from the mass; but I can well understand how sincere and earnest minds should be driven by their own inward struggles to this result, and I doubt not that among those who have thus willingly renounced the right of private judgment, and confided themselves and their dearest hopes to the keeping of an infallible church, have been some of the truest and purest spirits of our time." \* \* \*

"Complacent Protestants sneer at the Church of Rome; they marvel why she holds her sway over the souls of men. But the Church of Rome

consistent and not a few elect minds have been caught in the snare of its logic. Conspicuous among these is the illustration given by Dr. Briggs, of how a man may reach God through the second of the three great fountains of divine authority"—John Henry Newman, the leading spirit in that agitation in the Anglican Church, whose object was to arouse among the English people a deeper sense of the sanctity of the ecclesiastical organization. Newman shows in a manner which has had no such illustration since the conversion of Augustine, how that distrust of reason may logically end in acknowledging the supremacy of an infallible pope. It is now more than fifty years since he arose with, what has been called, his "fierce thoughts against a liberalism that was invading the Church," and the tendency to Romanize the Church of England which had been his unconscious purpose in the days of his greatest influence, after carrying to the fold of Rome hundreds of Englishmen of both clergy and laity, has not entirely lost its power. The object of the Tractarian movement was to overcome the prevailing liberalism of the times, and Newman's method was the restoration of the idea of the Church which had prevailed always in Latin Christianity. Accordingly his first effort was to revise the doctrine of the "apostolical succession" as it had been held by Tertullian, Irenaeus and Cyprian. Tradition was to take the place of free investigation as the sole authority of the truth, and the Bible was esteemed an unsafe book unless interpreted by the Fathers.

He began a quest after the "invisible divine power" or "ex-

---

embodies the deepest yearnings and instincts of human nature. She stands up in grand parallel with tendencies that are universal as man himself. What may seem her most arrogant and abhorrent claims, are precisely what is yielded with most grateful satisfaction. She meets those wants that every perplexed thinker at times must feel."

"The Church of Rome, claiming, as she does, to rest on that Rock against which the gates of hell shall not prevail, uttering an unerring wisdom, clothed with infallibility, going back in the unbroken succession of her bishops to apostolic days, carrying the same rites and ritual to every nation under heaven, speaking in one language to learned and unlearned, rich and poor, barbarian, bond and free,—meets and satisfies these yearnings of the soul for some authority that shall forever still its doubts."—"Orations and Essays" by Professor J. Lewis Diman.

ternal authority" whose supremacy was "the essence of revealed religion." This manifestly could not be the Scriptures, for they needed interpretation, and the real authority was the interpreter rather than the interpreted. It could not be the Anglican Church for it had no organ through which to speak; its bishops were worse than dumb; their voices were often contradictory, and oftener without authority. Thus Newman was forced to turn to the time when there was neither Anglican, nor Roman nor Greek Church but only the undivided church of east and west. In this Church, its fathers and its councils and its pope, he found the authority he craved; what was then always and everywhere believed by all was the truth. Skilful and dexterous interpretation made the theory work for a time but it finally became the justification of his consistency,—the condemnation of the Church he forsook, and the vindication of the Church he joined. He ended his struggle for truth in a special address to a distinguished company of English friends by asserting that all who abstain from submission of conscience to the pope are without religious "truth" and have nothing but "opinion" to rely upon, and by submitting himself formally to the decisions of papal authority. The process followed by this gifted Englishman seems to us to change the entire basis of human probation, when he affirms that we must not *struggle* for ourselves to know the truth, but, simply to submit to "an authority" which asserts that it *knows* the truth. It seems to us to be equivalent to affirming that submission to the papacy is the practical outcome of the incarnation, that for this the Eternal Son of God took our nature upon himself, and lived, and died, and rose and ascended, and sent the Spirit of promise. We may admit the logic and consistency of the system, but as for the truth we deny that it possesses it. This arrogant claim of the papacy is contradicted by fact, by history, and by the very nature of the matter in question. Christ erected no such tribunal to control the intellect and conscience of every disciple; while the inconsistent and often unscriptural edicts of the Church evince the falsehood of its pretensions. Certainly the Great Head of the Church could not have been so unwise and unmindful of the religious wants of mankind as to lodge au-

thority in a great ecclesiastical corporation which could have a Borgia for its head, the Councils of Ephesus and Constance for its boards of justice and the *index expurgatorius* and the encyclicals as its expressions of pastoral wisdom. Where could the authority of the Church have been in the times when many of the pontiffs, as presented in papal annals, were but hideous caricatures of a lofty and holy ideal, such for example as are illustrated by the unspeakable vileness of John the twelfth in the tenth century? or when Sylvester, John and Benedict, three of the worst pontifical scoundrels, were each clamoring for the chair of St. Peter? or in the times of the great schism when one pope excommunicated another pope and his adherents until the whole of western Christendom was excommunicated and the Emperor and Council had to take the matter in hand? When one recalls the times which have reverberated with the quarrels of high officials in the Church; the times which record hierarchical intrigues, strategems, combats and echoing anathemas: times marked by the crudest thought and the most childish superstition: the times of John XXIII. who poisoned his predecessor to secure the apostolic chair, and of Paul II., and Alexander VI., in which dispensations for robbery and fraud were granted on payment of money to a crusade, and of Clement V., when absolution was granted King John of France and his queen for the breach of any oaths and engagements past and future which it might not be convenient for them to keep, and of Boniface the IX. who established the sale of benefices into an organized rapacity—when one recalls such times, marked by such atrocities committed from the very seat of the papal throne, he may well ask, how can a church in which all this took place, in which all this could take place, be esteemed or declared infallible? How can a church, in which for centuries, an all pervading system of deception and violence has prevailed, be nevertheless declared to have itself remained pure and uncontaminated, and be regarded as authorized to speak authoritatively upon anything pertaining to religion and morals? The claim is absurd, monstrous, fraudulent and unscriptural.

2. We have, second, for our consideration the answer of the  
VOL. XXIII. No. 4. 63

rationalist, who finds the source of authority in the reason. So capacious is reason that its boundaries are not immediately felt as a hindrance, but the judgment of the race is, and always has been, that mere reason, exercising itself upon the field of nature, without any special help from God, is not adequate to the solution of the questions involved in religion. Conclusive evidence of this judgment we have in the fact that no religious system has ever existed among men, and asserted its ascendancy over them, professedly based on the authority of mere reason. All religions of antiquity, as well as those of modern times, have alike claimed to be supernatural in their source, and have been so accepted, so far as accepted at all. When we have rounded the entire circle of man's powers of ratiocination, we shall find the unaided reason inadequate as a guide in religion. Experience shows that in trusting to this alone, we are hopelessly adrift on a sea of errors, and that, so long as each individual makes his own opinion the single standard, there can be no judgment absolute and final. I use the term "reason" in its ordinary sense, not as the universal but as the individual reason; not the eternal law and principle of all things, the wisdom established from everlasting, but simply the human faculty, the process by which the finite understanding advances from premise to conclusion. This reason with which we investigate with marvelous success the laws of nature,—this reason will not serve us as well in those higher reaches to which the spirit within man soars, and satisfactorily answer its urgent and momentous questionings. And this is saying nothing deprecatory of this superb power and gift of God. To a fair mind there is no cant more offensive than that which seeks to exalt religion by depreciating reason. There can be no doubt also that much that passes as Christian truth is but imperfectly defined opinion, opinion which seeks to bolster itself up by a mere appeal to authority as to what Christianity is and demands, which involve, sometimes in the hands of some men, an entire appeal from natural reason to some dictum which compels submission whether it satisfies reason or not. There is nothing however in true religion which involves a contradiction of unquestionable truths of sense, reason or conscience.

We are not called upon as Christians to believe a proposition unless it is more rational to believe it than not to believe it. There is such a thing as evangelical rationalism, which is really a good word perverted. As now used it involves a claim by those who adopt it to be more fully guided by reason than others and that, as evangelical Christians, we cannot allow. We believe in reason and say with Bishop Butler—"Let reason be kept to, but let not such poor creatures as we are go on objecting against an infinite scheme that we do not see the necessity or usefulness of all its parts and call this reasoning." We believe in the capacity and duty of reason to judge of the evidence for anything claiming to be a revelation from God, but, when anything has been accepted as a revelation and its meaning ascertained, then it is the business of reason as reasonable to believe it. The confidence in God who gave us our faculties ought rationally to be as great as our confidence in the faculties themselves. If we cannot trust him we certainly cannot trust the faculties which have been given by him. Like some of old "professing themselves to be wise became fools," so rationalists professing to be rational have not infrequently become irrational. The conviction that the great truths of revelation are in conformity to an unperverted reason has pervaded the best minds of the whole Church from Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, to Jerome and Athanasius and from them to John of Damascus, and from John Scotus Erigena to Anselm, and from them to the present time. Thomas Aquinas assumed that revelation was not *contrary* to reason, but only *above* reason, as the kingdom of grace is above the kingdom of nature, and that therefore if reason could allege objections against revealed religion reason was also competent to meet and overcome them. In saying then that reason is not a source of authority in religion does not raise any question as to the legitimacy of using the terms which philosophy has elaborated and the methods it has followed in its quest after truth. Such use has the right which belongs to simple necessity. There is as much ancient philosophy in Justin Martyr as in Marcus Aurelius, in Origen as in Celsus. The philosophy which prevailed at Alexandria is as evident and active in Clement as in Philo. The history of Neo-Platonism is Christian

as well as pagan, and had almost as much to do with the formation of Athanasius and Augustine as of Plotinus and Porphyry. The philosophy of Greece had a divine function in the world as well as the law of the Hebrews. It is an impossible conception that the Holy Scriptures which have commanded the faith and moulded the life of the best peoples of the earth, when rightly understood, are incompatible with an unperverted reason, and hostile to the highest and best processes of human thought.

Rightly understood laws inscribed on external nature written in the mind and heart of man, and revealed in the word of God, must harmonize. They are all from the same infallible author. However they may differ, so far as they relate to diverse objects, they are one, and utter but one voice when they relate to the same things, and any contrariety must arise from misconceptions of, or false inferences from, one or more of them. There can therefore be no real antagonism between the normal reason, or the law written in the mind of man and that written in the revealed word, however greatly the latter may transcend and surpass the highest reaches of the former. Thus, for example, that men have always acted and reasoned on the assumption that conscience is the regal faculty in man, and entitled to rule, a truth stated and emphasized by Bishop Butler, and afterwards reinforced by Kant and Chalmers—that does not invalidate the truth that the Scriptures, as the unerring word of God, are the supreme and sufficient, as well as absolutely binding rule of faith and practice. Likewise in man's present abnormal state in sin, there is nothing in the rightly ordered powers of human reason which can be made to invalidate what the infallible God may teach as true. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that many aberrations of reason have been largely corrected in Christendom through the supernatural light of the divine word. The higher moral tone and better standards which Christianity has imperceptibly diffused and set up in the Christian nations are often proudly recognized and avowed even by those who assert the supremacy of the reason over the revealed word, while they forget their indebtedness to the Bible even for an enlightened reason, which they would pervert to its discredit.

The natural reason as it exists in Christendom, even in those who employ it to break down the authority of the divine word, as being counter to its dictates, owes its whole superiority, especially in moral insight, over the heathen, and its assumed authority and capacity to sit in judgment upon the Bible, or to rule out its distinctive teachings as irrational, to the illuminating and corrective teachings of the very word which it would adjudge by its own standards. Reason in Christendom is reason cleared of the mists with which heathen perversion had beclouded it.\*

In its sound and normal state then reason in its own sphere, will lead and command its own submission to the supremacy of the Bible, the moment that divine work is seen in the light of its internal or external evidences, or both combined, to be the word of God given by his inspiration and stamped with his infallibility. It will be seen as revealing the mind and will of God, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, and in a manner compatible with the individualities of style of the several writers, while it bears to every candid mind the impress of the divine mind and is recognized as the wisdom of one who spake as never man spake. And when once the reason comes to acknowledge the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures, through whatever proof, and deals with them as coming from God, it is that power which will be quick to discern beauties, harmonies and outshin-

---

\* "The reason in whose name Martineau criticizes revelation, and the conscience in which he seats authority, are not fresh creations; centuries of nurture are in them; much of what he finds there are inherited riches, wealth derived from remembered and forgotten ancestors to whom the Scriptures were a living authority. He may be content with his inheritance, but what his reason and conscience are, they are by virtue of what he is and has attempted.

"This means that reason is now so penetrated with Christian elements that a man even in reasoning against historical revelation cannot purge himself from what he owes to it; and it means more—that he has but to be faithful to his reason to be led beyond it to the source of the older formative influences. Certainly, though a man by reason may reject revelation, he can never without reason either know or accept it. And it is to reason that the living truth makes its ceaseless appeal."—Fairbairn's "Place of Christ in Modern Theology," p. 511.

ings of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, as well as in the heavens above and the earth beneath, and all blending in the effulgence of the one God of nature and revelation, which were hidden from it before. Mr. Martineau has said that "we cannot use our reason to find out essential or first truths, and then hold that our reason is not to be trusted." There is nothing in the recognition of the supremacy of the word of God as our source of authority in religion which in any way invalidates "first truths" or assumes that these must be given up. Much has been proclaimed in the name of reason against the word of God, which has been a spurious claimant to the dignity of "first truths," much of it has been neither first truth or twenty-first truth, but the outgrowth of poor scholarship and strong personal or partisan prejudice, or distortions and misapplications of such truths. Reason may find evidence of a divine revelation of truths entirely above its own plane and comprehension,—truths which it could never discover, master or judge by its own unaided powers of investigation and insight. Rationalizing and latitudinarian religionists are constantly striving to hurl the reason against the redemptive system, in respect to its supernatural provisions and methods for salvation. This includes certain truths which are affirmed upon the testimony of God's word, and to declare that God cannot without denying himself and abrogating "first truths" reveal such doctrines as the trinity, the incarnation, regeneration, justification and eternal retribution—this is an atheistic presumptuous, arrogant and irrational assumption. The faith which reinforces reason and trusts the testimony of God, is "the evidence of things not seen," in other words, things not discoverable by the powers of either sense or reason. "Religion passes out of the ken of reason," says Coleridge, "only when the eye of reason has reached its own horizon and faith is then but its continuation." And it is not a little ominous that there should be a striking agreement between Romanists and rationalists that Christianity cannot be "proved," as the phrase is, and that if its truth is admitted at all, it must be so, right or wrong, on the authority of the Pope or the Bible, and that too without asking what the Bible is or who the Pope is when he is distinctly speaking as the Pope.

The question then simply resolves itself into this: Shall I stop at the point in religion beyond which my reason cannot securely tread? Shall I abandon what lies beyond and give myself no concern but for that truth which can be demonstrated to the understanding? To do this is to abandon what man most wants to know. The deep and enduring thirst that the soul feels is precisely for the truth that lies beyond this bound; not for the knowledge of mere natural things, but of those deeper spiritual mysteries of the grace and kingdom of God that concern the soul's highest duty and destiny. Even to put these things aside as lying beyond the range of legitimate inquiry is in itself a virtual confession that the unaided human reason is no authority in such supreme concerns.

The witness of history too supports the evangelical position. Simple reason never yet has constructed a religious system which men have accepted as authoritative, or which has had any wide prevalence or power among men. The supernatural in religion is the only basis, as history has abundantly shown, upon which religion can rest, and at the same time take hold of the heads and hearts of men and sway them with an authoritative power. In religion, all the operations of the human mind upon a purely natural basis stop short of the final mark, find no resting place and do not get God near enough to answer its own wants. As has been said by another—"There is a spirit world beyond, conceivable, suggested, thought of, with which neither, the philosopher nor the metaphysician can make himself sufficiently familiar. The eye looks dimly into it. Startling possibilities flit through all this realm. Thought would like to go there, and feels as if it must do so. It hears the echo of distant truth and wishes to know whence the sound came and precisely what it means. The common mind asks for more than it can furnish, and more than science can furnish." And the Bible itself places its source far above the domain of reason. "Thus saith the Lord," is the label which it puts upon its own contents, and there is not a declaration within it which proceeds upon the hypothesis that its contents are the discoveries of reason. Its theory is always this, that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" and that God—

"at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets;" that the law and the prophets and the psalms proceed from God and are stamped with the impress of the divine mind and authority. The Gospel of the New Testament which "at the first began to be spoken by the Lord himself, and was confirmed unto us by those that heard him, God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will,"—that is, "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God." The validity of these claims, and scrutinizing of the credentials which this Gospel brings, is a question for reason to examine into and determine; and the man whose reason has found these adequate has found the ultimate religious authority for himself. The conspicuous failure of Unitarianism is an example of the inadequacy of reason in the question under discussion.

The agitation in the evangelical churches of New England nearly a century ago resulted in the formation of an organization which rejected the prevalent belief in the Triune God, and made the reason the umpire in matters of faith. It rejected the true Divinity of Jesus Christ, the authority of the Scriptures, the lost estate of humanity, the sacrificial atonement and all other features of what was known as evangelical religion, as absurd and irrational. It formulated no creeds, advocated absolute liberty of thought, and left the sphere of faith open to the will of every individual. The movement was declared, by many accomplished and brilliant men, to have inaugurated the day of spiritual emancipation. They had reformed the reformation with a declaration of war upon an impossible Trinity, an imaginary regeneration, an unnecessary atonement and a superfluous redemption. The movement was inaugurated by the sentiment and rhetoric of so great a man as Dr. William Ellery Channing. But the new reformation has been a demonstrated failure and a vain expectation. Adjudging all things in religion by the standard of reason, taking away from the Bible its inspiration, throwing the miracles into the waste basket, the enthronement of human nature, removing the offence of the cross, the peril of unbelief and retribution for sin, making all things lovely and sweet

and of good report—this was a program that seemed to be irresistible in its attractions for the multitudes who had groaned so long under the burdens of evangelism. As an intellectual revolt of men trained in the severe methods of thinking prevalent among the Puritans the movement doubtless had some influence, but as an effort to find a new source of authority for religious belief outside of the Scriptures, it was a dismal failure.

Neither is, what President Patton of Princeton has called "that compound of Hegel and Schleiermacher," the "Christian consciousness," more satisfactory. It belongs especially when taken along with its cognate doctrines, to the rationalizing method. "The spiritual consciousness," says the able successor of Henry Ward Beecher, "may be trusted and is in the last analysis the seat of authority in religion." He further declares that "the Bible is not an infallible standard of truth and life. It is the history of the growth of man's consciousness of God;" that the formula of evolution must apply to the spiritual life as well as the natural; that in the reformation of the sixteenth century an infallible book took the place of an infallible church, with far less real consequences, but still with evil consequences in demoralization both to the intellectual and moral life." The revival of this source of authority in religion in this country is an importation of a great truth too much emphasized by Schleiermacher who opened up a new era in the history of religious thought. Schleiermacher did not invent the Christian consciousness, however good may be the reason for associating the term with his name. He merely called renewed attention to its existence and importance. He regarded it as an independent source of theology, and made it the task of systematic theology to reduce the contents of this consciousness to order and unity, without reference to the Scriptures or philosophy, with the result of producing a subjective theology, based upon pious feeling and in many respects arbitrary and defective. This doctrine is also based upon a principle of the philosopher Kant, that in the consciousness of man lay the certification and authority of all truth. That may have seemed to be a metaphysical principle far removed from the popular apprehension,

and yet this, and numerous similar ways in which the people have responded in their views of religion, have shown how that speculative processes of the highest thought may be corroborated by the inward moods and necessities of the human soul. But the danger in the Christian consciousness lies in the way of introducing into the word or imposing upon it, one's own conception of what that word ought to contain, the letter becoming elastic, almost fluent beneath the touch of the interpreting spirit. "The Christian consciousness," says a lamented author whose early death caused widespread sorrow, "has its importance and its inalienable rights. But whether it be the consciousness of the individual or the collective consciousness of the Church, it is human and subject to error, and it must be measured and judged by the standard of the Bible."\*

We can lay no claim to an illumination like the supernatural inspiration of the apostles and to the receiving of revelations such as were vouchsafed to them, and the history of the Church has made it plain that to trust to an inner illumination, to Christian consciousness or experience, or any other subjective test of religious truth, has ended in unbelief, fanaticism and ecclesiastical anarchy. There can be no real Christian consciousness of which the Scriptures have not been, through the influence of the Holy Ghost, the source and rule. It is only through them that we are able to attain to it and understand it.†

The overthrow of all rationalistic heresies pertaining to the

\*"Present Day Theology"—by Professor Stearns, p. 87.

†No better statement of the Evangelical position can be given than this by Dr. Charles Hodge: "There is no form of conviction more intimate and irresistible than that which arises from the inward teaching of the Spirit. All saving faith rests on his testimony or demonstrations, (1 Cor. 11:4.) \* \* This inward teaching produces a conviction which no sophistries can obscure, and no arguments can shake. It is founded on consciousness, and you might as well argue a man out of belief in his existence, as out of confidence that what he is thus taught of God is true. Two things, however, are to be borne in mind. First, that this inward teaching or demonstration of the Spirit is confined to truths objectively revealed in the Scriptures, \* \* And second, This experience is depicted in the word of God. The Bible gives us not only the facts concerning God and Christ, ourselves and our relations to our Maker and Redeemer, but also records the legitimate effects of those truths on the minds of believers."

subject, would be hastened by a firmer and more persistent insisting, by all Christians, upon the supreme and supernatural facts of their faith. These are timely and wise words by the late Professor Stearns: "There is a latent rationalism lurking in the minds of Christians which makes them timid about confessing the reality of their faith as a living faith that lays hold upon the divine realities, and leads them in preference to talk and act as if it were a mere intellectual faith. Thus they come into the greatest embarrassment when the truth of Christianity is called in question and allow the unbeliever an easy victory over them. A little more Christian *rationality* is needed in place of this unchristian *rationalism*."<sup>\*</sup>

3. The third and Protestant answer regarding the source of authority in religion, is that which has been implied all along in our previous discussion,—the answer which traces it to the word of God. It is inconceivable that he who dwelleth in perfect light, and in whom is no darkness at all, should have doomed the human soul to the dreary prospect of endless doubt and uncertainty growing out of a disputable standard in religion. However men may differ respecting Scripture teaching, there can be no dispute respecting this that the Scriptures both represent the soul as created to know the truth and as finding enduring peace and satisfaction in that knowledge. When the principle of church authority represented by the hierarchy as the *ecclesia docens* was repudiated in the interest of reform, the appeal was taken by the reformers to the Bible as the word of God. Up to that time, in the long course of theological development, no attempt had been made to determine the relation of the Bible to the authority of the Church. The voice of the Church had been regarded as final in all matters relating to the faith, and a practical infallibility attributed to its decisions. When that authority began to be questioned and finally was set aside, it became necessary to find another authority to which all men could alike go in search of that absolute truth which God had communicated to men. Luther's revolt was against a church which had intrenched itself behind the arrogant assumption that the Bible was only a "deposit" in the hands of the

\*Stearns' "Evidence of Christian Experience," p. 291.

episcopate or hierarchy, and that to it alone belonged the right of determining what was the meaning of the divine revelation. He asserted the universal priesthood of believers, which meant that if the laity had faith, the spirit and mind of Christ, that they too were entitled to interpret the Scriptures. It was the affirmation of the right of private judgment, and as such was the first emphatic protest against the appeal of Irenaeus to tradition, the priority of which was guaranteed by the episcopate, or against the claim of Augustine regarding the divine prerogatives of the episcopate to teach infallible truth.

Luther stood with a majesty unsurpassed confronting the world which had been and that which was to be. It made no difference that he stood alone opposed by all the revered traditions of Latin Christianity—traditions that ran so far back into the past that they seemed to be coeval with Christianity itself. He stood there before his age with an uplifted Bible, and the truth which he read therein so corresponded with the experience within that it made no difference, as he said, though a thousand Augustines or a thousand Cyprians or a thousand councils were against him. When, in the face of the graduated system of ecclesiasticism in which the clergy represented the bishops, and the bishops represented the pope, and the pope represented God, he asserted the rights of the individual conscience and proclaimed the privilege of private interpretation, against all external authority, he asserted the principle which abolished all artificial castes, whether in church or state,—a principle it was by which every man became a priest standing in immediate relation to God, owning no other or higher allegiance than the will of God clearly expressed in the divine word, would sanction. Both evangelical and mystic reformers were united in rejecting the theory upon which the authority of the hierarchy reposed. Both had ceased to look upon the Church as a mysterious and supreme entity, existing apart from the people and possessing a deposit of supernatural trusts which it alone was authorized to administer. Protestantism from the very beginning rejected tradition and affirmed that creeds are to be received because they have the warrant of Holy Scripture and not because they are given on the authority of the Church.

Thus the Protestant doctrine on the subject, like that of Rome, may be said to inhere in its doctrine of the Church. Luther at once, after his break with the hierarchy, rejected the Latin idea of the Church and fell back upon the earlier and higher view of the apostles, that it was composed of the body of Christian believers ; that it was not merely an external institution ; that wherever there were true believers, let them be called by what names they may, that there was the holy catholic Church. Wycliffe, Huss, Savonarola, and others, while differing from each other in the extent to which they carried their opposition to mediæval doctrines, were alike in this respect, that they had been emancipated, even before the time of Luther, from the absurd idea that the Church was identical with the hierarchy. That idea of the Church expressed in the conception of the solidarity of the episcopate, holding by succession from the apostles, to which as a body was entrusted the graces and powers for the salvation of men, was the very first thing to give way before the revival under Luther. When men cannot look upon the Church as the association of believers, and an institution for the dispensation of the means of grace—as our Confession expresses it nothing else than “the congregation of believers”—then the axe was laid at the root of the tree and the human mind was free from the yoke of external authority, and the conditions existed for the restoration of the legitimate supremacy of the Scriptures as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. A great uplift had been given to society. Kings, princes, church and state bodily had a foundation placed beneath them all that will stand. The restoration of the supremacy of the divine word made the reformation possible as it has made our civilization a fact. The reformers were men who had hidden that word in their hearts and it made them what they were. The grandeur of their position before the world is that they stood on this Book and faced the world. Accordingly Luther's perpetual challenge was this, “If you will not refute me from the word of God, here I stand,” and Calvin's supreme and solemn answers when he was preaching, lecturing, journeying and formulating creeds and catechisms, while disease was disputing his life at every inch, was in the words with which he uniformly

closed his speeches and sermons, "If God's word be on our side who can be against us." It was in the constant reiteration of this truth in the controversies of the times, that the second of the distinctive principles of Protestantism, the formal principle of the Reformation, was reached and the traditional belief in the authority of the Roman Church overthrown.

What do we mean then when we give the Bible this lofty place? The reproach has been cast on Protestants of having replaced the pope with a book to whose authority they bow with a superstition equal to that of their Romish fellow-Christians. And in the most recent critical discussions we have had not a little about "bibliolatry." The charge however rests upon an entire misapprehension of the Protestant position. When we thus exalt the Bible over the authority of the Church, tradition and reason, and call it supreme in matters of faith and practice, we are not exalting the Bible as a book but as a record of God's redemptive revelation; because it brings us God's self-revelation in authentic and original form, and reveals to us the mind of Christ our Divine Lord and Saviour, the Way, the Truth, and the Life. At first the only foes of Protestantism were the Romanists, and accordingly the apologetical activity of the Reformers was directed chiefly against the old Church. The great question to be answered was, How shall we prove the Bible to be true, if there be no infallible church to vouch for it with its living voice of God? Christian scholarship might subject the Bible, as a whole and in its parts, to the proof of historical and literary criticism, and show that better grounds could be given for the acceptance of the books which compose it than for most works of ancient profane literature. But this was not sufficient. The question before the reformers was how shall we know that the Bible—the Christian revelation understood as the true doctrine of the gospel—is divine? In answering this question the Protestants did not fall back solely upon the historical and rational evidences. These evidences said they, since they rest merely upon the discoveries of human reason, can at the most give only a moral certainty, a high degree of probability. They do not give that divine and infallible certainty which the Christian needs in order that his own soul may

be satisfied and that he may have a sufficient answer to give the gainsayer. The certain persuasion of the divine truth of the Scriptures "must be sought," Calvin said, "from a higher source than human reasons or judgments or conjectures." What is this higher source? They answered, God himself? Luther's claim was that the individual could deal directly with God apart from the mediation of the Church and that God's word verified itself in the conscience of the individual, apart from the authority of the Church. "The Church," said he, "cannot give more force or authority to a book than it has in itself. A council cannot make that to be Scripture which in its own nature is not Scripture." Therefore no one shall turn me from the word which God teaches me; and that must I know as certainly as that two and three make five, that an ell is longer than a half. That is certain and, though all the world speak to the contrary, still I know that it is not otherwise. Who decides me there? No man but only the *truth*, which is so perfectly certain that nobody can deny it." Hence it is not by apologetic methods and logical processes but by inward experience that the word of God is verified as a divine and self-authenticating word. We receive the Scriptures as true because God is their author and speaks to us in a voice which cannot be misunderstood in and through them. We know that they constitute the word of God because the same spirit who inspired their writers and speaks to us through their pages witnesses in our souls to their truth. The appeal was to the inward witness of the Spirit which the unregenerate man did not possess. The witness of the Spirit to the believer's adoption and the witness to the divinity of the truth of the Scriptures are at the root one, parts of that one powerful influence of the Spirit upon the believer's soul, which constitutes one of the leading proofs of the reality of our religion as true and from God. In saying this however we do not affirm that we shall understand all the mysteries of divine revelation. Far from it: we shall still "know in part," and "see through a glass darkly." Unlike the Scribes and the Judaic schoolmen Jesus spoke directly to the soul from a direct intuition of the truth. He spoke as one who was conscious of being authorized to speak as never man spake. But it was far

from being true that the whole of our Lord's teaching was at once intelligible to every hearer, or at once commended itself as self-evident, however docile the hearer might be. There were "heavenly things" to be received then as now upon the testimony of Jesus. "If it were not so I would have told you."

Rome has always asserted that this principle of Protestantism has fostered unbelief. Well, if Protestantism is the foundation of unbelief, infidelity ought to be least vigorous where Protestantism is unusual. But in the very last century France was the centre of religious death; and yet in France Protestantism had been crushed by the edict of Nantes and those who remained loyal to the faith of the fathers suffered terrible persecution, and France has become the representative of republican unbelief. There is no country in Europe where all classes are to-day more penetrated with hostility to religion than in Italy, and in that country Protestantism has always been powerless. There was unbelief in Europe before Luther's time as there has been in Italy since. The revival of classical learning one hundred years before Luther was born was accompanied with a revival of Paganism. Plato seemed more interesting in those times, when the Church was supreme, to papal scholars than Christ, and Greek tragedians more wonderful than the Hebrew prophets. Men holding high positions in the Church before Luther was born had lost all Christian faith, and with its disappearance there was a departure also of Christian morality. A deeper knowledge of the magnificent treasures of ancient learning it was, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which has added new authority to Christ and the Christian Scriptures. This is the answer to the fallacious claim that the Protestant assertion of the supremacy of the divine word and the right of private interpretation, has fostered unbelief.

And more than this, the history of the Church will prove that every heresy and species of religious extravagance from the days of the schisms in the early Church and of the divergent vagaries of Gnosticism, down to the credulous revelations of Fox's inner light, the dreams of Emanuel Swedenborg and the fanatical and blasphemous claims of Jacob Schweinfurth, are traceable directly to a departure from the objective divine

word. Especially is this true of every species of religious radicalism or emotionalism, in which our own native promptings were mistaken for spiritual guidance; from Montanism to the last piece of Antinomian perfectionism in which the witness of the Spirit was dissociated from the living word. How painfully is this manifest in the times immediately succeeding that unquestionable work of God in the last century known as "The great awakening." The extravagant assertion, or misapplication of the doctrine of the immediate contact of the Holy Spirit with the human heart—a doctrine asserted by Edwards—was the occasion for the confusion, the divisions and separations and superstitions which disfigured that movement. So great were these evils that some have thought that the slumber of the American churches for nearly seventy years succeeding was owing to the reaction. What Luther had feared when he first heard of the teachings of the Zwickau prophets had actually come to pass in the New England churches. What the early Puritans had dreaded as the necessary outcome of Quaker preaching now resulted from the utterance of similar views by one from their own ranks,—one of the most honored names in American church history. Edwards himself recognized that this principle of the immediacy of the divine action produced the disorders, and, while not abandoning it, he labored to free it from abuse and misapplication. "Bodily effects"—faintings, fallings, trances and convulsions were cited as the best evidences of the Spirit's presence and power, until finally these came to be the tests of the validity of religious experiences, and a rivalry sprang up among the people as to who should display the most striking manifestations. The perversion of the truth was followed by most bitter results.

Thus the attitude of the mind of the Church toward the Scriptures as the supreme and final authority on all matters relating to religion, is an indispensable condition of the power of the Bible to control thought, to give instruction in righteousness, to sanctify the life and impart comfort to the heart. Those who really know this power of the divine word, are not the disputatious cavilers, nor the self-wise doubters asking more ques-

tions than they can answer, but the real children of faith who have attained unto the happy and hallowed art of knowing the word as of more value than all speculations of wisest men and hypotheses of most astute critics. This is the method to know the authority which rightfully obliges the will on the one hand and on the other the intelligence of man. In this vital concern, to the man whose judgment is not warped by some selfish purpose, or deceitful passion or unworthy plan of life, comes the assurance of the Lord—"Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." Whenever the impression prevails that the truth of God's word is problematical; that it stands for mere opinions rather than vitalizing religious doctrines and facts, it is no longer the word of a king which hath power, and its magisterial tone of authority hath been silenced. A leader of the Unitarian Church has said frankly that the Bible teaches the faith of the church known as orthodoxy. To overthrow that faith we must make men distrustful of the Bible. That can only be done by disloyalty to the first truth of Protestantism and denial of the formal principle of the reformation. No matter how tenderly you may guard the modern critical inquest, if once you begin to doubt the revealed word, to interject myth in order to explain miracle, to decide by grammar what should be regarded as canonical, and so to justify by philosophical or philological reasons, your withholding of faith in the word supreme, then the flood-gates are open for unbelief, the idolatry of reason and scholastic skepticism, and then cometh the deluge.

If hypotheses but recently affirmed, that the Psalter is simply a monument of the church consciousness during the centuries immediately preceding Christ; that Job and Jonah are only similitudes of the people of Israel; that the name of Daniel is enigmatical, and that the book which bears his name is undoubtedly of Maccabean origin and contains no Messianic traces; that Ecclesiastes is nothing but a record of doubts and unbelief rather than pious faith, marked by cold, skeptical philosophy and tempered with pessimism; that the pathetic 53rd chapter of Isaiah, which all Christendom refers to Christ, is only a prophetic dirge of Jeremiah used for Christian purposes;

that the prayer of Solomon [2 Chron. 6] is a literary fiction; that the song of Hannah is the work of interpretation by some unknown redactor; that the story of Joshua is due to a misunderstanding—if such revolutionary hypotheses are maintainable can we longer predicate the supreme authority of the Scriptures? Certain it is, that no heresy has ever yet become orthodoxy which has dealt with the Scriptures after this fashion. Properly understood there is a singular and beautiful harmony in all the factors entering into our subject. As Principal Fairbairn has said in his recent work on "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology"—"without God the Church has no Head and no end, the Word no truth and no function, the Reason no goal to reach and no object to revere; without the Church the Word has no medium to live in; without the Word the Church has no truth to live by."

The principle of the supremacy of the divine word in all matters pertaining to faith and practice is fundamental in Lutheranism, and, so long as that rightful supremacy is recognized, there is as much possibility of its facing Romeward, as that Leo X. shall visit America to attend a Methodist campmeeting, or that Justin D. Fulton will be elected as his successor as the occupant of the chair of St. Peter.

## ARTICLE III.

## THE MISSION OF EDUCATED MEN.

By S. G. VALENTINE, PH. D., Lebanon, Pa.

The circumstances and necessities of modern life require that, for his right equipment, a man shall have an education, and if possible, a college education. But even with that advantage, men nevertheless arrive upon the stage of the world's activities with a strange sensation of bewilderment, and of not knowing exactly their part in the drama. While they soon fall into place among the other actors, the question as to their special part and how they shall best fill it, confronts them, and will, for their lifetime. For surely educated men have a special mission in the world, and the advantages enjoyed bring a corresponding obligation.

Because of their advantages and presumed training for careful, consecutive, adjusted thought, educated men are expected to take a leading part in the practical affairs and movements of society. For an education that would train away from active interest in public concerns would be a social calamity. The days are, as perhaps never before, full of agitation. Many questions of vital import demand attention and settlement. Problems of poverty and wealth, labor and idleness, government and anarchy, virtue and vice, are before us for discussion and solution. Old ways of thought and old relations among men and things are being asked for their credentials. It is in many respects an era of readjustment. Here and abroad are agitator and theorist, with bomb and pamphlet, with grievances real and imaginary, demanding a hearing and a verdict. Some are provided with plausible sophistries, some ask questions hard to answer, all point to the existence of things out of joint in affairs. All must be met and settled. The task demands careful, discriminating thoughtfulness. It takes a well balanced man now-a-days to avoid the pitfalls on either side of the narrow

path of correct judgment. In view of the number of brilliant talented people daily led into new vagaries, it is needless to wonder why the average man finds it hard to choose a proper course of opinion.

Have not the college trained men of the country a wide field of usefulness in society amid all this confusion? They are called as leaders to the people passing through the desert of these radical social agitations. Assuredly those best equipped must guide the great host of the less informed. The people are generally and properly ready to give earnest heed to the careful, conservative views of the best qualified judges. The influence of one judicious, well informed, balanced man of culture in a community is tremendous, even though he be quiet and unobtrusive. Indeed the fate of *nations* depends upon the leadership of trained intellects. The Reign of Terror, and the days of the Commune in France were the outcome of a violent rebound in society, influenced by agitations uncontrolled and improperly directed. Neither right thinking nor right influences were in leadership, and France still carries the scar. Our own great nation stands to-day a memorial of another agitation directed by men of intelligence and discriminating judgment into proper channels. The brightness of such men shines all down our history and gleams far ahead upon the path of our future. Cut from our early history all that was done in the shaping of our nation's life by Samuel Adams, Jonathan Mayhew, James Otis, Hamilton, Jay, Scott, the Livingstones, Choate, John Adams,—all college trained men—and you will find a tremendous gap. In the great convention that framed our Constitution college men formed the majority. There were nine of them graduates of Princeton, four of Yale, three of Harvard, two of Columbia, one of the University of Pennsylvania, five or seven of William and Mary, one from a Scotch University, one from Oxford, others from elsewhere,—33 out of 58 were college trained and from these came the leaders! And what of the work Charles Sumner, Wendell Phillips, Channing, Longfellow, Lowell, Emerson, all college men, did for the freedom of the slave! But perhaps greater than of all these has been the influence, boundless, yet almost noiseless, coming from the

thousand points where educated men were placed who quietly and separately have lived their parts, creating from a myriad rills the mighty current that has borne us all along toward our great national destiny.

Evidently from his very position as an educated man the college graduate should stand for the development and maintenance of culture. Matthew Arnold finds the ground of culture in Montesquieu's words, "to render an intelligent being yet more intelligent," and its motto in the words of Bishop Wilson—"to make reason and the will of God prevail." In his charming essay on Sweetness and Light he proceeds to draw a picture of the men of culture that is well worth noting. "The great men of culture," says he, "are those who have had a passion for diffusing, for making prevail, for carrying from one end of society to the other, the best knowledge, the best ideas of their time; who have labored to divest knowledge of all that was harsh, uncouth, difficult, abstract, professional, exclusive; to humanize it, to make it efficient outside the clique of the cultivated and learned, yet still remaining the best knowledge and thought of the time." The world stands in great need of such men. Culture itself we take to mean the harmonious development of all man's powers and capacities, and their training and direction to proper ends.

We need more energetic culture in life. People are very much given to frittering away their time on trivialities. In business the tide of daily life is apt, even in college trained men, to set in strongly toward intellectual deterioration. There is nothing very uplifting in routine commercial affairs. The attorney lives in an atmosphere of musty precedent, disputes, caviling, avarice or revolting crime. The judge on the bench has the woes of humanity dinned in his ears. The physician finds his path among suffering, sorrow and death. He makes his rounds through perpetual distress and care. The journalist, in everlasting pursuit of news and sensation, must concern himself with much that is transient, worthless, or even worse. Sitting concealed like Dionysius of Syracuse he must hear all that goes on among earth's prisoners. The minister of God has quarrels and jealousies to adjust, debts to pay, and despite his high calling,

must pass through sloughs of non-culturing commonplace. Admitting all that is bright and glad in every life, reflection makes it easy to realize how the press and trend of circumstances are everywhere largely away from the development or maintenance of general culture. Life is full of retrograding and depressing influences from without and within which it is hard for the most noble and determined soul to resist.

Should not the college bred man uphold the elevating factors and help to hoist life out of every narrow rut, inspired as he has been by the advantage of a great dynamic toward things high and ennobling? He must stand in the community as representative of that intellectuality that lifts up the groveling necessities of daily affairs, opens the realm of cultured thought and learning, parts the lowering clouds of merely earthly pursuits to let in the warm bright radiance of that which shall illumine man's highest capacities. To him society should be able to look to represent and make efficient all the agencies that refine and exalt and bring recovery of humanity from degradation to dignity.

In his own personality, each man needs for himself that culture that shall prevent his occupation from becoming an end in itself and make it a means for the development of the best that is in him. Emerson says: "The common experience is that the man fits himself as well as he can to the customary details of that work or trade he falls into, and tends it as a dog turns a spit. Then he is part of the machine he moves; the man is lost. Until he can manage to communicate himself to others in his full stature and proportion as a wise and good man he does not yet find his vocation. He must find in that an outlet for his character so that he may justify himself to their eyes for doing what he does. If the labor is trivial let him by his thinking and character make it liberal. \* \* Foolish, whenever you take the meanness and formality of the thing you do, instead of converting it into the obedient spiracle of your character and aims."\* We all require that which shall help to make the current work of life potent in the unfolding of ourselves, our inner higher intellectual natures, something that shall transform and

\*Essay, "Spiritual Laws," 1st series, vol. I., p. 155.

exalt and bring all our powers to a harmonious and beautiful fruition. And no place or pursuit or surrounding in life is so ordinary or lowly as to deprive culture of its immense uplifting leverage. It deals with all who will deal with it, ready to reach forth to every quarter and condition. Consider that even the barnyard muck heap is made beautiful by the cultured genius of Landseer, and catgut sends forth sweet and wondrous melodies beneath the touch of Paganini's bow.

The college alumnus should stand for the intellectual and spiritual as over against the merely material in life. Ours is an age of great mechanical development. The pursuits of multitudes are along such lines. Right and wholesome ends are their goal, and the benefit to mankind has been unspeakable. All about us stand conveniences and advantages in all material directions that are monuments to skill and genius in mechanical pursuits. But in our estimation of all these things there inheres a tendency to unduly exalt the material. We view the greatness of our nation as a matter of railroads, mines, telegraphs, oil, coal, iron, gold, resources of all sorts, wealth, governmental machinery, in fine as a something wholly material. We estimate a man by his having built this structure, operated that system of works, produced that invention, financed that undertaking. We are not so curious as to what he is in himself. We forget at times that the highest type of perfection is not of the material but of the intellectual and spiritual parts. In both society and the individual it is something not external merely but inward; and whatever the gain to the world from the results of material pursuits, we view these aright only when we look upon them as forces acting upon intellectual and spiritual character. Educated men must stand as the protectors of society from abasement before its images of brass and iron, stone and clay. They must show that mind stands above matter; that the best fed, most comfortably equipped body may contain a starved intellect and stunted soul; that culture is not a mere synonym of comfort or convenience; that refined society is composed, not of those who surround themselves with refinement, but of those who contain it. They must prove that there are brighter

realms than the purely material and physical, and that man has higher and nobler capacities than the latter can satisfy.

Many ill results of the tendency to over-estimate the value of the material and mechanical in life are apparent on every hand. Look for a moment how it has affected the views of many on education. One phase of this appears in the view of which perhaps Prof. Huxley is as good an exponent as any. He says: "Education is the instruction of the intellect in the laws of nature, under which name I include not merely things and their forces, but men and their ways, and the fashioning of the affections and the will into an earnest and loving desire to move in harmony with these laws. For me education means neither more nor less than this."\* The inadequacy of such a theory is seen in its very foundation, which is pure phenomenalism,—holding possible only a knowledge of phenomena ignoring the perceiving *ego*, implying that beyond laws and forces we can merely conjecture. Mind, character and purpose are subordinated to mere succession of outward phenomena, making knowledge simply a knowledge of laws and "wisdom the skill to turn this knowledge to the best account,"†—a very dreary as well as grossly material and contracted outlook.

Another phase appears in the popular impatience here and there seen, with what are known as the more classical lines of study, in the interest of training on lines of distinctly material rather than intellectual utility. To many minds the best education is that which looks to material success in life. But granting technical subjects all they can rightly claim for their educational force, no simply technical knowledge, however complete, will of itself constitute an educated man. For this requires not merely sharpened faculties, but faculties enlarged and expanded, and the discipline of taste, judgment and imagination. "There must be adequate equipment for conflict; but that is a narrow culture which does not yield a comprehension of the real meanings, the living uses of the conflict itself, dis-

\*From "Culture and Religion," Shairp, p. 55. Quoted from address at South London Workingmen's College.

†"Religion and Culture," Shairp, p. 59.

closing the whole arena in its relations to an integral manhood. The deepest insight is then possible, one which transcends all culture and all formal science, seeing that these are but the superstructures, ever changing in form from age to age of human progress, and in every age built anew above a living foundation which is in the heart of man. By this vision youth finds itself and its power, its enthusiasm, its faith, are reinforced for the transformation of the life into which they lead."\* All special ideas of education—the ecclesiastical, practical scientific and industrial must be "absorbed in the spiritual idea of an education which shall develop a systematical manhood and womanhood, and fill the life of man with intellectual interests and rational delights."†

The unbalanced regard which we see paid to material and mechanical processes has been felt also in scientific investigation. Some have held that, as Carlyle puts it, "whatever cannot be investigated and understood mechanically cannot be investigated and understood at all."‡ This notion has been at the bottom of the materialistic evolutionary vagaries now so thoroughly discredited by true scholarship. Our research is apt to move in a decidedly artificial, mechanical way. We formulate our little theories, account for and classify, label and shelve objects or phenomena of all sorts, and are satisfied to let matters rest there. Carlyle lamented that "we are no longer instinctively driven to apprehend and lay to heart what is Good and Lovely but rather to inquire as onlookers how it is produced, whence it comes and whither it goes." Decidedly this mechanism in education and investigation is abnormal and while much lauded in many quarters, is like a cold blooded, unlovely, soulless Frankenstein, hard to hold in check.

Veneration for mechanical appliances is prone to produce reliance upon machinery for doing that which should be done by personal effort. We hatch our poultry in incubators, calculate and count money by machinery, work with all sorts of infallible logarithms that leave no chance for error, and are altogether so

\*From Editor's Easy Chair, Harper's Magazine.

†Prof. Wm. DeWitt Hyde, Journal of Education.

‡"Signs of the Times."

carried about that we almost forget how to walk. We want things done for us and avoid self-exertion. We look to processes for energy, prefer the channel to the stream, and even seek our personal intellectual culture from appliances. But there is no mill into which one can put the constituents and grind out this product. It can result only from the spontaneity and exertion of each individual. To believe culture to be the product of mere apparatus is to smother personality under appliances. Newton, Michael Angelo, Mozart, Descartes, Lock, Milton, Kepler, any man whose inborn genius or powers have, by proper development, brought him to his high place, is the product of no such process.

We see a similar mistake made in regard to government and even the Church. There is strong tendency to rely upon organization and machinery, good enough in themselves to bring about ends for which they are only the channels in which the real forces are meant to work.

We as college graduates should uphold and exhibit the benefit and worth of a real development of what has been called the "dynamical" side of man,—his powers and capacities,—and apply the principle in all relations of life. After all, men are and must be unsatisfied with the material and mechanical only and the tendencies they develop. There are capacities of heart and soul too great to be held in this iron bondage.

"Thus, in a season of calm weather,  
Though inland far we be,  
Our souls have sight of that immortal sea  
Which brought us hither,  
Can in a moment travel thither,  
And see the children sport upon the shore  
And hear the mighty waters rolling evermore."\*

Let us emphasize the fact that, above and beyond the mere accounting for phenomena and their classification, beyond externals and appliances, there are realms of the soul's activity, regions of the True, the Good and the Beautiful, of Hope and Love, all the greater verities of eternity and God,—wherein alone our powers find full expansion and are satisfied,—regions

---

\*Wordsworth, Ode, "Intimations of Immortality."

where we mount up out of reach of things earthly and perfunctory, unto the grand empyrean of Absolute Truth.

We often wonder why many men of college education fail to fully produce that effect within their sphere that was expected of them. Does not the reason too often lie in the fact that real intellectual growth ceases with graduation ; and the diploma, instead of standing for a brace to the growing tree, becomes a knife with which it is girdled ? But not thus can their high calling be met. No man ever yet had a "finished" education. What was begun at college must be continued through life. Intellectuality can grow only in a nourished mind, and growth is the *sine qua non* for fullest success.

No man who dwarfs his mental and spiritual growth can ever ripen his inherent possibilities, or achieve the complete development of what he might be. Nor can he be or do for the world what providence meant him. In curtailing his own personality and so also his power and usefulness he wrongs himself and the world. A college education is good, but good chiefly as a foundation ; worthless, entirely, as a finial. Forgetting this, many a man of fair intellectual power comes to nought because he breaks no new ground, and never after either cultivates what he has or expands to anything greater.

When descending the pulpit stairs after preaching his greatest sermon—on "The Government of God"—Dr. Lyman Beecher was asked how long it took him to prepare that sermon, and he replied, "About forty years, sir."

The preacher who closes his books and ceases his self-cultivation as soon as he is installed in a pastorate is doomed to be a failure. Why does he find it hard to write sermons but because of his neglect of that broad study and culture that are so helpful. *Ex nihilo nihil fit.* From a stunted mind will come only emaciated sermons and starved congregations. How can such a man do incisive thinking, make his preaching fresh, clear, attractive, acceptable and adequately impress the profound truths that are committed to him ? With a work to do that reaches out into all relations of life and affairs, how can he ever thus expect to gain that breadth of thought and mastery in work so indispensable to his true success.

Let the lawyer toss aside his Blackstone and Coke-upon-Littleton and, content with a bare admission to practice, essay to do without any further culture, and it will take no very astute prophet to foretell his end. Every fight for him needs fresh weapons, and he must be ever forging them. "Chief Justice Parsons, when an attorney once astonished Alexander Hamilton, his opponent, by the ease with which he demolished one of his strongest points. But when beginning practice he had access to the best law library in New England and had literally mastered it, making briefs of the most important cases, among which were several involving the very point in question."\* The young attorney, O'Sullivan, who in a recent famous trial in New York shattered the finest expert medical testimony in the land, and sprang, at one bound, into fame, must certainly have prepared himself for it beforehand.

Why does the educated business man sometimes see his routine work wearisome, and his mental powers getting narrow and shrivelled, but because he denies the latter any food.

Why is it that there is so much superficial thinking, so great lack of "body of thought" in many men, but because that broad culture, only obtainable by incessant, extensive mental activity, is neglected. The sure result is devitalized thought and the vanishing of intellectual power. Why is it that specialists are so apt to get contracted views and see everything through their own special media, but because they were made specialists first, and their culture has been built up on a narrow base, instead of their specialty being grounded on a broad culture. The capstone does very well to top the pyramid, but it was never meant that the structure should be inverted and rest on its apex. Culture of that sort is perpetually falling over on one side or another and its *dicta* are absolutely worthless and misleading. For, remember the times demand not merely proficiency in one's special line of work, but beyond that is needed an expanded culture. For, singleness of aim in life does not require monotony of action. The world wants men of extensive information, whose intellectuality has a wide horizon and firm

---

\*Matthews, "Getting on in The World," p. 254.

grasp, and it has a right to look for such among the college graduates. Moreover, every man needs for his proper effectiveness the broadest culture he can get. The wider his horizon, the greater his command of the views of others, the more luminous his insight in all directions, so much the greater will be his equipoise and the more inexhaustible his fountains of power. He must gather large intellectual capital by hard labor. No man can draw very heavily upon an account if he fails to make heavy deposits.

Think of the expansive reach of cultivation in Mr. Gladstone. It might seem that the demands of state-craft were enough to have absorbed all his time. Yet he has shown himself at home in the fields of ancient literature, a scholar of religion and an orator of magnificent power, having brought into his service the learning and cultivation of the past and present, and attained a prompt and imperial command of thought and language that have come from intense and continued application. Chauncey Depew is a familiar example of the same thing. It is simply amazing to see in his speeches a familiarity with almost every line of cultured thought. He sweeps over the fields of history, literature, science and philosophy with an ease and grasp that are astonishing, and has found time for such broad development amid the pressing duties of a railroad president.

We need not all hope to be Gladstones or Depews, but we can all keep on growing. It is worth remembering that the only opposite of growth is deterioration. The only point at which one neither grows nor degenerates lies in intellectual imbecility. Stagnation is generally but a prelude to putrefaction, poison and death. But duty and success require that all that is potentially in every man shall be developed, trained and directed, as far as possible, to its true ends. Perfection must be his ideal, and his culture the outcome not alone of study and books, but of self-discipline and intercourse with living hearts.

"Thus alone can we attain  
To those turrets, whence the eye  
Sees the world as one vast plain  
And one boundless reach of sky."

But in all this we must never forget that the spiritual side of man is as much a reality as the intellectual, nor allow mere intellectuality to lead away from spiritual progress. There is a good deal of sham culture these days in every direction and many a shadow is mistaken for substance. Hypotheses and speculation are not science; agnosticism is no measure of man's mind; ethics is more than humanism, or any "calculation of the profitable." But God is as evident as gravitation, and his revelation of himself never stood on better certified ground than it does to-day, after resisting the assaults of the centuries. The highest attainments are entirely compatible with the grandest faith. "Not as men of science, not as critics, not as philosophers, but as little children, shall we enter into the kingdom of heaven."\*

"Let knowledge grow from more to more,  
But more of reverence in us dwell;  
That mind and soul, according well,  
May make one music as before,  
But vaster."†

Intellectuality alone cannot pierce the arcana of eternity, but spiritual vision and reverent faith are the keener probes. And so nearly all the great of earth have feared God.

"Our little systems have their day,  
They have their day and cease to be,  
They are but broken lights of Thee  
And Thou, O God, art more than they."‡

In speaking of and advocating culture I do not view it as in any sense antagonistic to religion, but as in perfect harmony therewith. Culture, with the aim of developing man's nature to its highest perfection, must include in this action the "Godward aspects" of humanity, must "embrace religion and end in it."§ Religion must cultivate all our powers as from God, and to fulfill the purpose for which they were given. So that, in the words of Principal Shairp, "ideally considered, culture must

\*Shairp, p. 127.

†Tennyson, "In Memoriam."

‡Tennyson, "In Memoriam."

§Shairp, p. 30.

culminate in religion, and religion must expand into culture."\* But the spiritual stands above the intellectual, and can only find its highest development in harmony with a Higher than itself. God only can strike and wake the grandest harmonies from the soul of man. And the belief that it is God's purpose to lift the world upward to himself embraces all there is in intellectual culture and vastly more, bringing the only real hope for humanity. Restoration and perfection must come from powers outside of, and beyond man. "Of such powers no tidings reach him from any quarter of the universe save only from the Revelation that is in Christ Jesus."† Thence only comes the truest philosophy of life, and the brightest light shines upon its path, illuminating its mysteries, explaining its perplexities, showing the goal. Thence it is, in Whittier's beautiful words—

That more and more a Providence  
Of life is understood,  
Making the springs of time and sense  
Sweet with eternal good :  
  
That death seems but a covered way  
Which opens into light  
Wherein no blinded child can stray  
Beyond the Father's sight :  
  
That care and trial seem at last,  
Through memory's sunset air,  
Like mountain ranges overpast  
In purple distance fair :  
  
That all the jarring notes of life  
Seem blending in a psalm,  
And all the angles of its strife  
Slow rounding into calm.  
  
And so the shadows fall apart  
And so the west winds play,  
And all the windows of my heart  
I open to the day.

*—My Psalm.*

\*Shairp, p. 31.

†Shairp, p. 138-9.

## ARTICLE IV.

## THE SOURCE OF AUTHORITY IN CHRISTIAN BELIEF.

By REV. E. F. BARTHOLOMEW, D. D., Professor of English Literature and Philosophy in Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill.

In the fierce warfare of iconoclasm which in our day is waging, not alone in theology, but also in the broad field of ethics and common Christian belief, some strategic points have been disclosed to which the eyes of all both friends and foes of Christianity are anxiously directed. Among these and claiming special attention at this time is the question of authority in matters of faith.

Across the threshold of our subject lies another question, which though distinct is yet inseparably connected with it and antecedent to it. Before we can intelligently discuss the question of rational, ecclesiastical, or even Biblical *authority* we must consider the matter of a standard of faith which is fundamental to authority. Before there can be any such thing as authority in the right sense of the word there must be established law and the consciousness of law.

Is there, then, such a thing really and practically as a *standard of belief*? In our day when individualism and radicalism have degenerated into a very licentiousness of liberty, can there remain any fixed and authoritative law of faith? Judging from outward appearances we might easily be led to believe that all standerds, literary, aesthetical, ethical, and religious, are relics of the past, that conservatism has been swept from the field, that with social anarchy the reign of moral and religious anarchy has been inaugurated, and that henceforth every man is to be a law unto himself. But we must not judge thus. A superficial interpretation of phenomena whether in nature or human history is always defective and misleading. While the surface of our modern life is broken up into bubbles, foam-spots, and eddies, under the agitated surface there is a deep, placid, powerful stream heading unto eternity, which under

God's direction is carrying mankind unerringly to its proper goal and the world to its appointed destiny.

History and the nature of things justify this opinion. The popular feeling seems to be that faith is waning, that all standards are slowly, but inevitably passing away. So it may seem, but the real meaning of the signs of the time is something quite different. The real tendency is not so much to set the old standards aside as to set them in a better light and on firmer ground, so that their authority may be the more irresistibly felt.

In the light of these remarks it can already be seen, not only what *is* but what *must be* the answer to our preliminary question. Recognized and authoritative standards always have been, always will be, because they *must be*. The ground for fixed standards of different kinds is found in the nature of the human soul: men always will recognize such standards because their psychological nature demands this. Hence also the Church's historical standards are to be viewed not as priestly inventions for the enthrallment of thought and conscience, but as normal and necessary forms of progressive spiritual life. The superficial aspects of mental, social and religious life vary with times and circumstances, but that which is truly fundamental in the nature of the human soul is as fixed and unvarying as the soul itself. On this rock the argument in this paper is based.

First. The nature of faith makes necessary a standard of belief. What is faith? The popular conception is of little value in the present discussion. Instead of giving a formal definition we shall attempt to frame one on the inductive plan. We start with a psychological analysis of the act which is called faith. A little reflection will make plain that faith in the sense in which we are using the word is complex in its nature and therefore is capable of analysis.

The ultimate element disclosed by our analysis is *intelligence* that is, an act of the rational understanding. Faith rests on evidence, and evidence in order to have any validity to us must come into our minds as knowledge. Hence the Apostle to the Hebrews very significantly says, "Now faith is the ground of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." And Paul to the Romans: "How then shall they call on him in whom

they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? \* \* So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," (Rom. 10:14-17.) Here the apostle plainly lists faith in the category of the soul's intellective modes. Faith without knowledge is not faith at all, only a certain superstitious credulity which has no edifying efficacy but tends to mental darkness and spiritual decay, and readily deteriorates into the most dangerous forms of fanaticism.

To the the intellectual element must be added the *emotive*, just as we always find it in ordinary acts of knowing. Every act of knowing is accompanied by an appropriate feeling, and every feeling waits on knowledge. In evangelical faith we first learn some things about God, the supreme object of our faith (hence, the prime necessity of the Gospel), and then this knowledge of God awakens certain emotions, such as love, fear, reverence, etc.

Now, to the emotive element is joined a third, viz., the *volitional*. As every emotion waits on knowledge, so every volition immediately waits on emotion. In this last found element something is given which was not present in the two preceding elements, namely, a commitment of the soul to the object of its faith. When we know God as an object of love and worthy to be trusted to the full extent of our conscious needs we commit ourselves to him.

The three elements so far discovered constitute what we will venture to call *scientific faith*, which is only a lower aspect of true evangelical faith. But in this there is as yet nothing disclosed that is truly and essentially distinctive of true faith. We must now carry our analysis up into the higher rational nature of the soul. In passing from the lower into the higher we do not leave behind or discard what has already been attained in the lower. The lower remains just as we have found it in all of its elements, but to it now as basis is added something in the higher which is radically distinctive, and which with the preceding constitutes true faith.

Faith in the aspect now attained is a *spiritual induction of the reason*. The reason, like the understanding and the sense, has its gradations. These are, first, scientific induction; secondly,

theistic induction; thirdly, ethical induction; fourthly, spiritual induction. The last named is equivalent to faith. Faith thus is the highest mode of the reason's activity. Standing in the midst of the field of ordinary knowledge, emotion, and volition, and surveying all in the clear light of its perception, the reason lifts its eyes aloft and sees things not visible to the eye of sense and understanding—sees things spiritually discerned. In its highest function the finite human reason knows not only that there *is*, but that there *must be* an Infinite Reason that gave it its own existence and upholds all things. While it cognizes a temporal world spread out at its feet, it knows that beyond this stretching out into infinity is an invisible, eternal world as real, as necessary to rational finite existence, as the temporal is to physical existence. Knowledge in the lower has become spiritualized in the higher, and the soul lives in conscious communion with the heavenly Father and in spiritual union with the Saviour of men. It is thus sheer nonsense to talk about conflict between faith and reason. There can be no such conflict when the true nature of each is rightly understood, for one is but a mode of the other. To reason in its highest function of faith, the "evidence of things not seen" appeals as powerfully and authoritatively as does the evidence of "things seen" to the scientific understanding. To be faithless is, therefore, as irrational as it is unchristian, unphilosophical and unscientific.

Having thus found the rational nature of faith, we are prepared to see the *need of a standard belief*. The ground of such a standard is found in the nature of the reason. In the aesthetical function, for example in literature or the fine arts, there is recognized a *standard of taste*, which, though in less important details it exhibits diversity, yet in its essential nature shows substantial unity. So, again, in the ethical function there is a standard of right, which is invariable and infallible. As in the aesthetical, so in the ethical function of reason there are some variable and hence fallible elements, but this is never true of that which is truly fundamental and distinctive in any of the reason's modes of activity. Is conscience an infallible guide, and does it give an invariable and authoritative rule for conduct? When we rest on a right conception of conscience we must

answer affirmatively. The cognition of right and wrong is not the distinctive function of conscience: that is the office of judgment, and is capable of modification by time, circumstances, education, climate, etc. On this supposition moral law is merely relative and there can be no invariable standard of right. The scientific judgment standing in the lower psychic nature can never give an authoritative rule of right. But conscience everywhere is felt to be authoritative, and hence must have an element in it not given in the judgment. Such a truly distinctive element is found in the universal sense of OUGHT, and in the concomitant sense of APPROBATION OR CONDEMNATION according as the reason's rule of right is obeyed or disobeyed. That which is universally felt to be authoritative in conscience is given by the reason and is everywhere and at all times the same. As the reason thus has an accredited standard in its aesthetical and ethical modes, so likewise must it have in its highest mode, namely, *faith*. *A priori* considerations lead us to expect this, and history and observation prove the fact.

But the standards so far attained are chiefly subjective. We must now go one step farther and consider the need of an objective rule or canon. In passing from the subjective to the objective we do not cast aside or ignore the former: the one is the natural complement of the other, and so neither can be a substitute for the other. This fact has most important bearings, for in it is already foreshadowed the method which the Holy Ghost must use in bringing to the soul of man a divine revelation and in working human regeneration.

The reason must have a criterion external to itself to which it can refer all matters of supreme importance, first, *because of its own limitations*. Though proceeding from the Infinite, it is itself still finite. Though the reason transcends immeasurably the realm and sweep of the senses, it can never feel absolute certainty in its inductions because it knows its own finiteness. Secondly, the reason needs a guide because its natural vision has become deeply obscured by sin. It is probable that if man had never sinned there would have been no need of any outward revelation or divine interposition, for then all the things useful for the development of his proper life could have been

derived from the soul's own resources. But as man has fallen away from God and his will has become antagonistic to that of the Divine Father, his reason has become so darkened that it cannot discern the things that make for his peace. Therefore, in his finiteness and obscuration of vision there is need of an objective unerring criterion to which he may appeal in matters of doubt and of eternal consequence. In this way alone can he gain that certitude which is necessary, not only for his peace in respect to future possibilities, but also for the right ordering of his life here upon earth.

Having shown the need of an external standard of faith we must in the next place consider certain qualities which such a standard must possess in order to be authoritative.

First. It must have the *universality, uniformity, and inevitableness of law*, even the unchangeable law of God. It matters not how much or how little we may be able to see of it on its human side or how imperfectly we may understand the part we do see, we must feel assured that on its other side it rests on absolute ground, that it is rooted in necessary and eternal truth. Manifestly nothing capricious or contingent can ever satisfy the reason's demands.

Secondly. Closely associated with the quality of universality is that of *infallibility*. Before the soul can commit itself to any given form of belief with certitude and with that degree of self-respect which the reason by right of divine inheritance always demands, it must know that its rule of faith is infallible. And it is for this very cause that the reason looks for a standard outside of itself, since as a matter of conscious experience it does not find an infallible rule within itself. To illustrate, we feel safe and comfortable in the hands of a guide in a strange and dangerous place just in proportion as we have confidence in his trustworthiness and inerrancy. So we have joy and peace in believing, just in proportion as we have certitude in regard to the infallibility of our adopted rule of faith. The doctrine of papal infallibility is entirely consistent with the view the Romish Church holds as to the relation of the pope to Jesus Christ. If the pope is a true vicegerent to the Church *in loco Dei*, then his dictates should be infallible and ought to be considered ab-

solute and authoritative. The philosophy of the pontificate on such a basis is true, and the conclusion of infallibility on such premises is unquestionably valid. What the philosophy of the papacy thus demands for the pope the human reason in a higher sense and on better ground demands for its standard of faith.

At this point a third essential quality of our rational standard comes into view, viz., its *divinity*. To be infallible it must be divine for infallibility is nowhere to be found outside of Divinity. The human reason, though the offspring of the Divine and bearing the image of the Infinite, even in its highest and purest inductions is always conscious of its native limitations and still more of the obscuration of its vision by virtue of sin. Therefore in matters involving eternal interests, it cannot feel sure of its own conclusions and so flies to the bosom of God to find in him the certainty which it does not and can not find in itself. Reason everywhere demands absolute ground and the authority of law, but, in the noble words of Hooker, "Of law there can be no less acknowledged, than that her seat is the bosom of God; her voice, the harmony of the world." So then, in order that our standard of belief may be invested with that measure of authority which the reason demands, it must have the universality and uniformity of law, it must be infallible, and it must be divine. Having these qualities our external standard will be acknowledged authoritative and will satisfy the reason's imperative demands in all of its modes, and no less in the highest, namely, faith.

Having established the rational demands for an objective standard of faith and having pointed out its essential qualities, we are now prepared to assert, in the second place, that the BIBLE IS SUCH A STANDARD. The word of God comprising the Old and the New Testaments meets every demand of the human reason and so is the ultimate and only source of authority in matters of faith.

The closing decades of the nineteenth century will go down into history as a period of mighty conflict. As now, after the first fierce onset the smoke of battle is gradually clearing away, the friends of evangelical religion from every watch tower in Zion and from every advantageous point of outlook are anx-

iously surveying the field to ascertain what things yet remain. And truly it is matter for devout congratulation on the part of Christian believers that they still have left them an unmutilated Bible. The Bible has indeed been cast into a sevenfold-heated furnace fire of criticism, but it has come forth with not even the smell of fire upon it. It has been subjected to the test of the scalpel, the microscope, the balance, and the crucible, but it has stood the test and to-day is found not wanting. Tried, but not destroyed; roasted in the refiner's pot, but not consumed. The higher criticism has brought some facts to light, and so has rendered Christianity a positive service, but as yet not a single fundamental Biblical doctrine needs be surrendered. Whatever other effects of secondary importance the higher criticism may have, this is at least true that the authority of the Holy Scriptures has not been impaired. Even in those quarters where the higher criticism has done its most destructive work, the Bible to-day maintains its authority and influence both in its public ministration and its private use. The Gospel of Christ, in Germany, Scandinavia and Great Britain as much as anywhere, and to-day as much as ever, is *felt* to be and *proves* itself to be "the power of God unto salvation." In support of this statement may be mentioned the fact that in Protestant Germany and Scandinavia the Lutheran Confession is almost universal. "The Lutheran Church is firmly and deeply grounded on the word of God, and stands immovable amid the upheaval and tumult that are shaking some other creeds to their very foundations. While some advanced critics and over-wise rationalists are seeking to adjust their faith to modern thought or scientific discovery, the Lutheran Church as such knows of nothing in her creed that has become unsettled, nothing that has to be given up." When we remember that a church whose aggregate membership in all the continental divisions of the globe numbers over fifty millions of souls, holds unmoved the pure unmutilated word of God as its only rule of faith and practice, it is evidence of no small value that in this day of destructive criticism the authority of the holy Scriptures has not been seriously impaired even in that part of the world and in that branch of the Christian Church where criticism has done its worst work.

What is the testimony of the Lutheran Church on the question of the source of authority in Christian belief? In her confessions she gives no uncertain sound touching this point. In the Introduction to the Formula of Concord stands the following confessional declaration: "We believe, teach and confess that the only rule and standard according to which at once all dogmas and teachers should be esteemed and judged are nothing else than the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament. Other writings, of ancient or modern teachers, whatever reputation they may have, should not be regarded as of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures, but should altogether be subordinated to them, and should not be received other or further than as witnesses, in what manner and at what places, since the time of the apostles, the doctrine of the prophets and the apostles was preserved. \* \* \* The Holy Scriptures alone remain the only judge, rule and standard, according to which, as the only test-stone, all dogmas should and must be discerned and judged, as to whether they be good or evil, right or wrong." And in the comprehensive summary of the Formula the same doctrine is reiterated in these strong and unequivocal words: "We receive and embrace the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the pure, clear fountains of Israel, which are the only true standard whereby to judge all teachers and doctrines. \* \* God's word alone is and should remain the only standard and rule, to which the writings of no man should be regarded equal, but to it everything should be subordinated."

These confessional utterances may be taken as fairly typical of what is substantially held by all the other great communions touching the authority of the Holy Scriptures and the fountain of authority in Christian belief. On this impregnable rock the Christian Church is established, and all the waves of rationalism and skepticism that may spend their rage against her, are not able to move her from her foundation. Contrary to popular fears, I believe that the Church of Christ to-day more than ever before feels the rock underneath her and discerns her true foundation stones.

Historically, then, it is true that the Church regards the Bible just such an outward standard of faith as the human reason demands, for on the contrary supposition it would not be possible for her to maintain her self-respect. But according to Dr. Briggs "there are historically three great fountains of divine authority,—the Bible, the Church and the Reason." Though regarding this famous utterance with large charity, I still think that the Union professor was unfortunate in statement. Over against the professor's "three fountains of authority" we are constrained to put *but one fountain of authority*. If he means that the Church and the Reason are sources of information concerning the divine will and the divine government in the world, then we may agree with him, but in no sense can they be regarded as co-ordinate authority with the Bible in matters of faith.

The fundamental error in the position of Dr. Briggs and of his school lies in a misconception of the nature of reason and its relation to faith on the one side, and to God's absolute authority on the other side. If there be first a right psychology there will likely follow a true theology. It was in order to set this point of error in its right light that we in the first part of this paper developed the doctrine of a rational standard of faith. If now we bring to bear the results of our psychological analysis upon this question of authority we shall not commit the error of making the reason and the Bible co-ordinate sources of authority. The one point of prime importance and of special emphasis, brought to view in our analysis is the fact that the reason, when once it has found an objective standard that satisfies its demands, will allow only one criterion, one supreme law, one final word of authority by which everything else must be judged and guided. The reason is absolutely exclusive in its dictates and such a thing as co-ordinate authority in matters of faith is impossible, contradictory, and never to be thought of. Our doctrine also sets the reason into its right relation to God's voice as the instrument of the Holy Ghost in the act of inspiration and in the giving of a divine revelation to man.

Finally, we must inquire wherein the authority of the Bible consists. The line of argument here must be identical with

that already traced in the development of a rational standard of belief. In pursuance of this line we are led to say that the authoritativeness of the Bible must be sought in itself, namely, in that it combines in itself in complemental unity those qualities which reason demands in its accredited standard, namely, the universality any uniformity of law, infallibility, and divinity. These requisites are found in the Holy Bible and so make valid its claim to be the only rule of faith and practice. The Bible has its authority in itself and does not derive it from any foreign source. It is its own warranty and makes its own credentials. Were it not so, no amount of dogmatic assertion or superstitious veneration could ever invest it with such an authority as it is felt to possess. The Scriptures give certainty because they have the certainty in themselves, they are in themselves infallible and divine. They are authoritative because they are the word of God, and so final. "Their authority is thus not contingent, but inherent and necessary as the God-given norm of Christian faith and salvation in the Church."

The supernatural self-attesting power of the Bible is felt not alone by the piously inclined, but also by those in whose nature there is no predisposition to conform to its precepts. What the soldiers testified concerning the preaching of Christ when they exclaimed "Never man spake like this man," the multitudes of great and small, high and low, learned and ignorant everywhere testify concerning the sacred Scriptures. What all the people felt in their hearts when, listening to the Saviour's teaching, they declared that "he taught them as one having authority," is precisely what every soul feels in regard to the teachings of the divine word.

Whether in the matter of personal regeneration, or Christian nurture, or sanctification, or good works, in every case the Bible proves itself a primary and most precious means of grace adapted in every respect to the deepest needs of the soul and responsive to every demand of the reason.

It is not affirmed here that the Bible is the sole source of truth, nor the only medium of communication between God and man, for such is not the case. God reveals himself, after a manner, in various ways. In the works of nature, in human

history, in human reason God speaks a message to man, but nowhere else as in the volume of his word. The Bible is therefore, not the sole source of truth, but it is the *sole norm of truth*, the sole divinely accredited standard of faith by which all doctrines are to be tested. In the Scriptures alone has God given us a blessed word of life, a heavenly means of grace, an infallible and authoritative rule of faith. In the solemn silent depths of the human soul God whispers of eternity, of immortality, of everlasting life. In the holy Scriptures these indistinct murmurs, these faint intimations, these intuitions of divine things are clearly and positively voiced; and the reason hearing this voice and recognizing its divine authority reverently responds to it as did Thomas of old to the Master's challenge, "My Lord and my God," but like the sheep of the good shepherd, the voice of a stranger it will not hear.

Two great principles constituted the life-blood of the Reformation of the sixteenth century—*Christ and the word*. The same two mighty principles, the word of God and the living Christ who vitalizes that word must constitute the life-blood of the Christian Church in the twentieth and subsequent centuries, if she is to be the medium of salvation to the world. There is only one voice which God's people in all ages can safely follow. The sheep hear the Shepherd's voice, and he calleth his own by name and leadeth them out; but a stranger will they not follow, for they hear not the voice of strangers. There is *but one final rule, one voice* of the Infinite that speaks with an authority all its own. "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book. If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the tree of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

---

NOTE.—This paper was prepared for, and read before the Tri-City Ministerial Union, at Moline, Ill., March 6th, 1893. The Union by special resolution requested the manuscript for publication, but hitherto it has been withheld, and now for the first time appears in print.

## ARTICLE V.

## SPENER ON BAPTISM.

A translation of several of the "Tabulae Catecheticae" made by REV. E. J. METZLER, Altoona, Penn'a.\*

## THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL.

I. What they are. II. What they profit. III. What is their number.

I. *What are they?* They are divine acts in which God, by means of visible signs, seals and imparts the invisible grace of his promises.

Whence have the sacraments been derived? From God, who alone can ordain the sacraments.

Why? Because he alone can give what the sacraments promise in the sacraments, and he it is also who in the sacraments themselves works through his ministers.

Whence is derived the power of the sacraments? Not from men, but from God; for they are not merely human, but divine acts, even though they are administered by men.

Of what do the sacraments consist? They consist in the performance of an act, or in a certain administration.

How long does a sacrament last? No longer than the administration.

What shall be done with the elements remaining over? After their administration they have lost their sacred character,

\*Because Spener was a Pietist it has been assumed that he was indifferent to doctrine and held loosely to the tenets of his Church. So it is, conversely, taken for granted that any one who in our day holds firmly to the Church's faith cannot be a Pietist, that is, a strictly pious man after the model of Spener and Francke. What amount of truth there is in the logic which makes Pietism and Lutheranism opposites, may be inferred from the study of this portion of the "Tabulae Catecheticae" which were prepared by the founder of Pietism in 1683 and which for generations were a standard among his followers in the University, Church and family.

and they again became ordinary water and ordinary bread and wine.

When does the earthly unite with the heavenly? To name the moment is the prying of an unseemly curiosity.

Is it proper to carry the bread in procession as the Papists do? No, such carrying about and worship is both superstitious and idolatrous.

What belongs to a sacrament? Something visible or earthly, and something invisible or heavenly, a sacramental union uniting the two.

Who is to administer the sacraments? Ordinarily ministers and teachers.

How in a case of emergency? For the time any believing Christian may administer the sacraments.

Does an emergency arise often in connection with holy baptism? Yes.

Does it also arise in connection with the Lord's Supper? No, ordinarily no such necessity arises with it, since in such case the spiritual enjoyment may suffice.

What is to be the state of mind of the officiating minister? The power and validity of the sacrament are not dependent on the intention, purpose, worthiness or piety of the minister.

II. *What are the Fruits or Benefits of the Sacraments?* The awakening, strengthening and sealing of faith.

How is this effected? The grace of God which is offered and preached to us through the word is applied to us in the sacraments.

How do the sacraments work faith? Not alone by way of remembrance, for then they would be mere signs; but by a supernatural virtue and power, derived from their divine appointment.

Is this power of God effectual with all? No, only with those who do not resist the divine action.

Why is this? It is an idle imagination for one to suppose that the sacraments are efficacious in a man simply because he uses them, and has performed the act, when he has neither faith, devotion nor even any good motion in connection with it.

Do then the sacraments of themselves impart the grace of

God? Yes, and this grace our faith lays hold of according to the divine plan of grace.

Are the sacraments necessary to salvation? Yes, the sacraments are necessary to salvation, and God has made the observance of them obligatory upon us.

*III. How many sacraments did the Old Testament have?*  
Two, circumcision and the passover.

What was circumcision? A seal of the righteousness of faith. Rom. 4: 11.

May a Christian still be present at a Jewish circumcision? No, for that would indicate that Jesus had not yet come.

How many sacraments has the New Testament? Two also, Holy Baptism and the Holy Supper.

Are two sacraments sufficient? Yes, for in baptism we are received into the covenant with God, and in the Holy Supper we are confirmed in the covenant with God.

#### OF THE CHIEF CONTENTS OF PART IV., CONCERNING BAPTISM.

I. The nature of Baptism. II. The power and efficacy of Baptism. III. Our obligation regarding Baptism.

*I. What must we note in the nature of baptism?* Five things.

Who instituted holy baptism? Jesus Christ, our Redeemer, Matt. 28: 19, 20.

Who is to administer baptism? The apostles and their followers in the holy office.

How in case of an emergency? In case of an emergency any person may baptize specially or privately.

Who are subjects for baptism? All nations, all, namely, who become disciples of Christ, all who are to be saved.

Shall children also be baptized? Yes, since God who wills that they be saved, gives to them the right to the sacrament of salvation, and the corruption in which they were born renders the same necessary for them.

Of what does baptism consist? Of something earthly and visible, and something heavenly and invisible.

What is the earthly and visible element? Common or natural water.

Which the heavenly and invisible? The Holy Ghost united with the word. We must be born again of water and the Spirit. John 3:5, 6.

What determines the nature of baptism? That we are baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

What then takes place? God receives us into his covenant.

II. *What blessings do we receive through baptism?* They are twofold, it delivers us from evil and imparts something good to us.

What is the evil from which baptism delivers us? From sin, from spiritual and eternal death, and from the power of the devil.

How does it deliver us from sin? Not that man is absolutely divested of sin, but that his sin is forgiven, and is not imputed and its rule is broken.

Does it deliver us also from temporal death? Yes, in so far, that nothing can be injurious to a baptized Christian, who remains true to his baptismal covenant.

What is the good which baptism imparts to us? Eternal salvation, which in holy baptism is not only promised to us but is also communicated.

What are the treasures of grace received? The sonship with God, the righteousness of Christ, and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

How is it in regard to the treasures of glory? A baptized Christian has a clear title to them and has a sure hope of enjoying them hereafter.

How do we on our part become partakers of these benefits? By faith, which holy baptism either effects or seals.

In whom does it effect faith? In little children.

In whom does it seal faith? In adults.

Whence does the power and efficacy of holy baptism proceed? It does not proceed from the nature of water, for it cannot do such great things.

Whence then does it proceed? From the word of God, which, when united with the water, causes it to be a sacrament.

Is the word of God so powerful? Yes, the word of God is al-

mighty; as it was able in the first creation to create all things, so also in the second creation of the new birth is it able to produce a new creature.

What other factors have part in this? Faith, which believes the word of God. Mark, 9:23. The Holy Ghost who works renewal and regeneration. Regeneration is perfect, but renewal is imperfect.

Can these be lost again? Yes, but through divine grace both may again be wrought and regained.

What is our obligation respecting baptism? This is shown us by the ancient custom, by which formally the subject was submerged and then again drawn out from the water.

What did this signify? The death of the old man and the quickening of the new man.

How is the old man slain? By daily sorrow and repentance and by the cross.

How may the new man be known? By faith and its fruits. 1 Pet. 3:21.

How shall the water be applied in baptism? It shall be poured upon the person to be baptized.

By what mode shall the water be applied? There is no difference, whether by dipping or sprinkling or pouring.

How often shall we apply the water in baptism? Three times, that is in accordance with ancient church custom.

What is the heavenly or invisible thing in baptism? The whole Trinity, in whose name we are baptized. Matt. 28:19. Especially the Holy Ghost. John 3:5.

Is the earthly united with the heavenly? Yes, by means of the word of God, the heavenly and earthly are united.

How long does this union continue? Just as long as it requires to administer the sacrament.

How are we to interpret Acts 8:16, where the apostles baptized in the name of Jesus? We have no authority to conclude that they changed the formula of baptism, but they, as we, baptized by virtue of his suffering and death.

## OF THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM, OR THOSE FOR WHOM BAPTISM WAS INSTITUTED.

I. *Who is to be baptized?* (1) Human beings and not church bells. (2) The living and not the dead. (3) Men and women. (4) Children and adults.

What course is to be pursued with adults? They must first be thoroughly instructed.

II. *Shall infants also be baptized?* Yes.

What children are to be baptized? Such as have been born of Christian parents, or in a rightful way have come under the control of Christians.

Why shall we baptize children? Because they are conceived and born in sin and are by nature the children of wrath. Eph. 2:3; Ps. 51:5.

How are we to interpret Paul's statement, 1 Cor. 7:14, that children born of believing parents are holy? Paul does not speak of an inward, but only of an outward holiness.

What is inward holiness? A holiness with which they can appear worthy before God, partakers of God's grace and contribute something to their salvation.

Have children such holiness before baptism? No.

What holiness, then, do they possess? External holiness.

In what does this consist? In the right to enter into the covenant with God, a right which heathen children do not have in virtue of their birth.

Is it right also to baptize infants? Yes.

How can this be proven? By five reasons.

What is the first reason? Because they are in need of regeneration, for they are flesh, born of the flesh, John 3:6. They are therefore not to be deprived of the means of regeneration.

Can God serve also without means? Yes, but we are bound to the use of the means.

Do we deny salvation to those who without their fault fail of baptism? No, not the lack, but the contempt of baptism condemns.

What is the second reason? Because the divine covenant belongs to the children, and the promise of God gives them a right to it. Acts 2:38.

What is the third reason? Because Christ commanded little children should be brought unto him, and imputes salvation to them.

What is the fourth reason? Because baptism has taken the place of circumcision. Col. 2: 11 f.

What is evident from this? If it was not displeasing to God, that the children were circumcised on the eighth day, so it is not displeasing to him, that holy baptism be imparted in like manner to infants of tender age.

What is the fifth reason? Because the apostles baptized whole households, and to these certainly little children also belong. Acts 16: 15-33; 1 Cor. 1: 16.

Can children also believe, are they also capable of faith? Yes, they are capable of faith, Matt. 18: 6; 19: 14.

Wherefore? Because they are capable of salvation, but without faith, and indeed without personal faith, no one will be saved, Heb. 2: 4.

Have we any examples that little children are susceptible of the gifts of the Holy Ghost? Yes, the example of John, who was filled with the Holy Ghost before his birth. Luke 1: 41; Ps. 22: 9, 10.

Whence do children have faith? Not from nature, but through the operation of the Holy Ghost. Eph. 2: 8.

By what means does the Holy Ghost work faith? Through holy baptism, by which we are received into the covenant with God.

What kind of faith do children have? A true and divine faith.

Can children comprehend what is reasonable? No, yet are they not incapable of receiving the light of the Holy Ghost.

Do such children have a divine knowledge? Yes, though they may not comprehend, that they have this knowledge, nor form an intelligent conception of it.

How long do they retain this faith? Until they begin to be capable of the ordinary means of faith, which is the word of God.

But suppose they do not avail themselves of that? Then their faith is extinguished and ceases to exist.

## ON THE BENEFITS OF BAPTISM, WHICH CONSIST IN THE DELIVERANCE FROM EVIL.

The evil from which baptism delivers is threefold: I. Baptism delivers from sin. II. From death and III. From the devil.

I. *Which is the first?* It bestows and works the forgiveness of sin. Acts 2 : 38; Eph. 5 : 26.

What sins are forgiven? All sins, original and actual sins, committed before as well as after baptism. 1 John 1 : 7.

On what is based the forgiveness of sin, which takes place after baptism? On the baptismal covenant, upon which depends its validity.

Wherefore? Because the baptismal covenant with God is in its nature eternal and inviolable.

How long will the power of baptism accrue to our good? Just as long as we hold on to Christ in faith, or turn again to the grace of God.

How are we freed from sins in baptism? Not, that no more sin is found within us, but that because of the grace of God and by virtue of the covenant, they are not imputed to believers, Rom. 8 : 1.

Does the flesh also still cling to those who are born again? Yes, it remains and ever entices them to evil, but the power of the old Adam is weakened by the grace of the Holy Spirit, that he no longer reigns nor overpowers us. Rom. 6 : 6.

By what power does baptism effect this? By the power of the blood of Christ, for the power of the blood of Christ, has been deposited in baptism. Heb. 9 : 14, 15, and is bestowed upon us in baptism. Hence it is said, Gal. 3 : 27, in baptism we put on Christ. He is the propitiation for all our sins.

II. *From what else does baptism deliver us?* From death.

How many forms of death are there? Temporal, spiritual and eternal death.

\*What is understood by temporal death? The sufferings and miseries of this life, as well as the dissolution of the body and the soul.

Does baptism deliver us from the sufferings and miseries of this life? Yes, in so far as it takes the curse from them

so that these sufferings cannot harm us, but prove beneficial, yea instead of a punishment, become a salutary cross.

Does baptism free us from the dissolution of body and soul? No, but we have to thank holy baptism for this, that death is to us no longer a real death.

What then is it? To believers death becomes a sweet sleep and a gateway of life.

Are we also delivered from spiritual death? Yes.

In what way? That we, who beforehand were dead and without strength are endowed with new power to do good, and with a spiritual life, and come to enjoy again the favor of God.

How is eternal death destroyed? In this, that it no longer has any claim against believers who are baptized.

By what power is baptism able to do this? By the power of Christ, whom we put on as the conqueror of death.

III. *From whom does baptism finally deliver us?* From the devil.

Whence has the devil power over us? It is derived from sin. Rom. 6:16.

In what does the power of the devil consist? In three things.

What is the first? He ensnares men and plunges them into one sin after another. 2 Tim. 2:26.

What is the second? He invokes the divine justice to take vengeance upon us. Rom. 12:10.

What is the third? By God's decree and permission he inflicts upon us all manner of injury to body and soul.

How is this power taken from the devil? Not to the extent that he no longer tempts us and contends against us, but that he cannot injure or overpower us without our consent. 1 Pet. 5:8, 9; Eph. 6:11, 12.

By what power is the power of the devil taken away? By the power of Christ, who has overcome him. Heb. 2:14; Rev. 12:11.

Do we renounce the devil in holy baptism? Yes.

Why do some evangelical churches in the administration of baptism use the words, "come out of him, thou unclean spirit?" Not because the children are bodily possessed of the devil, but

because on account of their natural depravity they are subject to his control.

Why are these benefits treated of in the fourth part? Because Christ through holy baptism imparts the blessings which he has merited for us.

ON THE BENEFIT OF BAPTISM, WHICH CONSISTS IN THE BESTOWMENT OF A BLESSING.

I. The blessing we receive. II. The continuance of such blessing. III. How the blessing is imparted. IV. Those who receive and keep this blessing.

I. *What is the blessing which we receive in baptism?* Salvation.

In what does this consist? In the removal of all evil, in being freed from all distress and misery, and in the enjoyment of the highest good.

What is the highest good? God alone, and indeed the entire Holy Trinity, which is imparted to us because we are baptized in the name of the three Persons.

What does the Triune God do in holy baptism? The Father adopts us as his children; the Son bestows upon us his righteousness, Gal. 3:27; the Holy Ghost seeks to dwell in us in order to sanctify us, yea to be our teacher, guide and comforter, Titus 3:5, 6.

What are the chief portions of our salvation imparted to us by baptism? The sonship of God, the imputed righteousness of Christ, and the sanctification or indwelling of the Holy Ghost.

Is this a great salvation? Yes, he that has this, has all things and can desire nothing more.

What flows from this? Rest for the soul, peace of conscience, freedom from the law, communion and union with Christ, Rom. 5:1, 2; 8:1, 2; John 17:22.

What besides? God's fatherly care for us also in temporal things, the favor of God and the eternal inheritance, Ps. 103:13, 14; Mal. 3:17; Col. 1:12; Rom. 8:17.

II. *How long does it last?* It is an everlasting salvation. God does not take away from his children what he has be-

\*

stowed upon them. He does not repent of his gifts, Rom. 11 : 29.

Did God give them to us that we should preserve them? Yes, they are even in themselves not fleeting nor temporal; they are also kept for us by God himself, 1 Pet. 1 : 5.

Are there means at hand, whereby they may be preserved? Yes, the word of God and the Holy Supper.

Can a man lose salvation? Yes.

Can he also recover it? Yes.

How? By repentance.

Must baptism be repeated in the case of penitents? No.

Why not? Because salvation once attained is eternal and the covenant on the part of God is inviolable. Rom. 3 : 3.

III. *When is this blessing imparted to us?* In holy baptism. Baptism gives us this salvation.

How does it give us this salvation? It not only promises the same for the future, but gives it to us immediately now; wherefore we are already saved. Rom. 8 : 24; Titus 3 : 5.

Is there then no distinction in respect to the enjoyment of salvation? Yes, there is a distinction in respect to the kingdom of grace and that of glory.

This distinction is fourfold.

What is the first? Here in the kingdom of grace we do not perfectly understand these blessings, but there in the kingdom of glory we shall perfectly know and comprehend them. 1 Cor. 13 : 12.

What is the second? These blessings here in the kingdom of grace are mingled with manifold trials, but there in the kingdom of glory there will be no more sorrow. Rev. 21 : 4.

What is the third? Here in the kingdom of grace we have some blessings in a yet imperfect state, those, namely, which relate to our sanctification and renewal; but there we shall have all in the highest degree of perfection. 1 John 3 : 2.

What more will be added? Some new blessings of salvation, the transfiguration of our bodies, the vision of God and the like.

What is the fourth difference? In this world these blessings may be lost, since we are still in the conflict; there, however, we can never more lose them.

What then is baptism? The fountain (Brunnquel) of our salvation.

IV. *Who receives, enjoys and keeps this blessing?* All who believe. Salvation and its blessings imparted to us in baptism continue just as long as our faith continues.

When do we lose these blessings? When faith is thrust out and lost.

How is faith thrust out? When one despises the means by which it is enkindled and preserved; or contents himself with their external use, and hinders their efficaciousness.

What are these means? The word and the Holy Supper.

In what other way do we thrust out faith? By reigning sins, by covetousness, pride, lewdness, drunkenness, and such like.

In what way is faith wrought in adults, and in infants? Faith is kindled in adults by the word of God, and is sealed in baptism, but in case of children faith is awakened in baptism.

OF THE BENEFITS OF BAPTISM WHICH CONSISTS IN KEEPING US FROM SIN.

There are four reasons why baptism should draw us away from sin: I. Because of the promise we made to God in baptism. II. Because of the precious gifts presented to us in it. III. Because of the great injury which would otherwise follow. IV. Because of the great benefits which we should derive from it.

I. *Why should baptism deter us from sin?* First, because of the promise we made to God in baptism.

What promise did we make to God? In baptism we entered into the covenant of a good conscience with God, 1 Pet. 3 : 21, and renounced the devil and all the pleasures of the world.

To whom then are we bound? Not to the world, but to God. We have declared ourselves enemies of Satan, therefore we must also prove ourselves his enemies.

II. *What are the precious blessings which were presented to us in holy baptism?* The sonship with God, the righteousness of Christ, the grace of the Holy Ghost, regeneration and salvation.

What is the first blessing thus bestowed upon us? The sonship of God.

Of what shall this remind us? Since we are not children of the devil, we should also not follow him. John 8 : 44.

Are we then only children of Adam? No, we are not only children of Adam, but also God's children. Hence our life must differ from those who have nothing beyond the corruption of Adam.

What is the difference between God's children and those who are merely the children of Adam or of men? Those who are merely the children of men are unable on account of their sinful birth to refrain from sin.

Are the children of God able? Yes, those that are God's children are able to refrain from sin, on account of their spiritual birth of grace which is from above. 1 Jno. 3 : 9.

Of what is our sonship to remind us? That we do not stain, by an unbecoming life the high dignity we enjoy in being children of God.

What is the second blessing bestowed upon us in baptism? The righteousness of Christ, for we have put on Christ, Gal. 3 : 27.

To what should this incite us? That we do not defile this righteousness through wickedness and sin.

Why not? Our sins were forgiven, but not that we might commit them anew again. In Christ we have died unto sin.

Has the righteousness of Christ also freed us from the servitude of the devil? Yes, and on that very account we should not again submit ourselves to it, 2 Pet. 2 : 20; Judges 5 : 23.

What is the third blessing bestowed upon us in baptism? The grace of the Holy Ghost and regeneration.

To what should this incite us? Since the heart has been cleansed, that we do not again pollute it, Acts 15 : 9.

What then shall we do? We are not to profane the temple of the Holy Ghost, but on the contrary use the powers which we have received to make resistance to sin.

How shall we guard ourselves in reference to this blessing? That we do not grieve the Holy Ghost, or even drive him from us, Eph. 4 : 30.

What is the fourth blessing? Salvation, which flows from the preceding blessings.

To what should this blessing incite us? That we so live, that everyone can see that we live no longer in the kingdom of Satan but in the kingdom of God and of salvation.

III. *Will we also suffer injury if we do not let ourselves be kept from sin by Holy Baptism?* Yes, a two-fold harm.

What is the first? If we sin wilfully our guilt is much greater before God than that of others who have not been baptized.

Why? If we live again according to the flesh, we forfeit all the benefits and fruits of baptism, because we reject the covenant of God.

What is the other injury? The damnation of those who were baptized will be much greater than of others, Matt. 11:22, 24; Luke 12:47.

IV. *What benefits do we derive from holy baptism if we let it keep us from sin?* The benefit is four-fold.

What is the first? If we cease to serve sin, God by virtue of the divine covenant of grace will not impute to us the weaknesses and sins of infirmity which still cleave to us.

What is the second? The weaknesses of which we become conscious in contending against sin will, on account of the baptismal covenant, not be imputed to us by God, when we contend and do not suffer ourselves to be overcome.

What is the third? Every victory against the flesh is an instrument for the next victory, since the flesh is thereby weakened but the spirit is strengthened.

What is the fourth? Our faith will be most gloriously strengthened by this evidence that we are warring against sin, Rom. 7:14, 25; 2 Pet. 1:10.

#### ON THE BENEFIT OF BAPTISM WHICH CONSISTS IN THE INCENTIVE TO LEAD A CHRISTIAN LIFE.

The four principal grounds for this incentive are: I. The promise we made. II. The precious gifts we received in baptism. III. The injury that would otherwise follow. IV. The benefits we have from it.

I. *Why should our baptism incite us to lead a Christian life?* Because of the promise we made in it. For baptism is the covenant of a good conscience with God, 1 Pet. 3:21.

How was the promise made? Through the mouth of our sponsors we promised to believe in the Triune God.

What did we promise? We promised to bring forth the fruits of faith and among them the first one, love, which indeed includes all the others.

II. *What further should incite us to a holy life?* The spiritual gifts which we received in holy baptism.

What are these spiritual gifts? They are four-fold: The sonship of God, the righteousness of Christ, the grace of the Holy Ghost, regeneration and salvation.

To what should sonship with God incite us? It should be a constant admonition and encouragement to us to love our heavenly Father and our brethren. 1 John 5:1, 2.

To what are we obligated by this sonship? That we are to be followers of God, and obey the promptings of the Holy Ghost, who is a spirit of sonship, (adoption.) Eph. 5:1; Rom. 8:14.

To what shall the righteousness received from Christ incite us? To follow his example, to serve him in his kingdom. We must be new creatures, 2 Cor. 5:17; bear much fruit, John 15:5. Yea, he must live and work in us. Gal. 2:20.

Why? Because in holy baptism we have put on Christ. For as many of you, as have been baptized have put on Christ. Gal. 3:27.

But if one fails to live in accordance with his baptism? If one lives differently it must be concluded that he has again put off the garment of salvation.

To what shall the grace of the Holy Ghost and of regeneration incite us? That we after baptism are changed from what we have been, and therefore the fruits of the spirit must appear on our lives. Gal. 5:22; Eph. 4:21, 24.

In what consists the salvation which we received? It consists in these three blessings, and is derived from them.

Are we then already saved? Yes, but we must further wait for the glory which shall be revealed in us.

What is our duty, then? We are to live so, that it may be seen in us that we are destined to live in eternal glory.

What more should we have a care for? We must continually

occupy and exercise ourselves with those things, which shall be our joy and happiness in eternity.

III. *Will we also suffer injury, if we do not allow holy baptism to incite us to holy living?* Yes, a twofold injury.

What is the first? Our negligence is a much greater sin, because we received more than those who are not baptized.

What is the second? Those who have not availed themselves of the powers, which were granted to them from above, will have to endure a much greater punishment.

IV. *What benefit do we derive if we allow holy baptism to incite us to a Christian life?* A fourfold benefit: there follow namely, growth in renewal, the good will of our heavenly Father, sealing and confirmation of our calling, and greater aptitude in doing good.

In what consists the growth in renewal? That by virtue of regeneration we do much which to flesh and blood seems impossible.

In what consists the good will of our heavenly Father? That he takes pleasure in our sincere though imperfect obedience. God accepts from his children even that which is imperfect.

In what consists the sealing of our calling? In the assurance of faith from its fruits. 2 Pet. 1:10.

How do we gain greater aptitude in doing good? The more we practice the good, the easier will the divine life become, and, the sooner will we succeed in every way. 1 John 5:3.

#### OF THE BENEFIT OF BAPTISM WHICH ACCRUES TO OUR COMFORT.

Four questions are to be answered here: I. Who are those who comfort themselves in their baptism? II. How long does such comfort last? III. On what ground does such comfort rest? IV. In what does such comfort consist?

I. *Who may comfort himself in his baptism?* Not every one who is baptized, but only he who remains steadfast in the state of regeneration, or who through repentance has returned again to the same. Ezek. 18:21, 22.

Why may not everyone comfort himself in his baptism? Because many reject the grace received in holy baptism, faith and the Holy Ghost, and give themselves again to the service of sin.

Does baptism avail nothing to such? No, all the comfort which they fancy to derive from their baptism is but a vain and fruitless imagination of man.

Is it only believers who may comfort themselves in their holy baptism? Yes, only believers, even though their faith be weak. For faith depends not on the feelings but on the truth of God, 2 Tim. 2:13, and is known by its fruits.

II. *How long does this comfort last?* It will continue evermore, throughout the entire life of a baptized Christian, and even in death.

But if a person has lost this baptismal grace? Then the door of return to the same through repentance stands open and free; because the covenant on God's part is inviolable. Ezek. 18:21, 22; Rom. 3:3.

III. *On what ground does this comfort rest?* This comfort is not based on the perfection of our renewal but it rests on the gracious promise of God, and on the covenant of grace, which God made with us forever.

Whence then does this comfort arise? All our merit and all our own worthiness contribute nothing to it.

What then does produce it? The grace of God, which has not only begun the work of salvation, but ever continues it and will also perfect it. Eph. 2:8; Phil. 1:6.

Against what things does holy baptism give us comfort? Against sin, against the devil, against death and against the divine wrath.

How does baptism comfort us against sin? That all our sins, original as well as actual are not able to injure us, and that the short comings committed in our weakness will not be imputed to us.

What more? Baptism also comforts us against sin, in that we need not fear lest sin will finally overpower us and bring us under its yoke. Rom. 6:14.

How does baptism comfort us against the devil? That in Christ who has overcome the devil we are enabled to overcome all things, since we have put on Christ in baptism and are made partakers of his victory. Rom. 8:37.

How does baptism comfort us against death? That to us

death is no more death, John 11 : 25, 26, and that all other afflictions can no longer harm us, but must turn to our advantage. Rom. 5 : 3.

How does baptism comfort us against the wrath of God? That we who are in Christ are no longer under the law, and that hell has now lost its claim on us. Col. 2 : 12, 14; Rom. 6 : 14.

In what may we comfort ourselves by virtue of our baptism? There are four chief things: Our sonship with God gives us comfort, the perfect righteousness of Jesus Christ, the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, and actual salvation.

What comfort does the divine sonship give us? It is fourfold.

What is the first? The sonship includes the grace of the heavenly Father and his love.

What is the second comfort? From the sonship flows God's care for us, his fatherly patience which he bears towards our weakness. Ps. 103 : 13, 14; Mal. 3 : 17.

What is the third comfort? His long-suffering towards our faults, his gracious chastisements and his solicitude for our temporal subsistence. Jer. 31 : 20; Heb. 12 : 9, 10; Matt. 6 : 32.

What is the fourth comfort? That God makes all things which befall us in the present life, work together for our good. Rom. 8 : 28.

What comfort flows from the righteousness of Christ? From it flows our reconciliation with God, an eternal pardon of sins, peace with God, deliverance from the law, union with Christ as our Head, and the communion of his treasures and glory. I Cor. 1 : 10; Eph. 5 : 26, 27, 30-32; Rom. 5 : 1, 2; 8 : 1, 2; John 17 : 22.

What comfort does the indwelling of the Holy Ghost give us? He causes us to realize his action, his impulse to what is good, his witness which he bears with our spirit that we are God's children, the spiritual joy and the foretaste of eternal life. Rom. 8 : 15, 16; Eph. 1 : 17, 18.

How can we take comfort in our real salvation? That we have already received it, with the sure hope of the future revelation and of the perfect possession. Titus 3 : 5; Col. 3 : 3, 4.

## ARTICLE VI.

THE STAR, WORMWOOD;  
OR, AN ERA OF DISTURBED FEELING IN THE CHURCHES.

By PROF. W. H. WYNN, PH. D., D. D., Midland College, Atchison, Kan.

Only by way of analogy, and purely as a figure of speech, have we called in this awful imagery of the apocalypse,—the plunging of the Star Wormwood upon the third part of the rivers and fountains of the earth, and men dying of the waters because they were made bitter. We have no theory of the "seven trumpets," and do not venture on the uncertain distribution of the historic fulfilment of the judgments therein described. Simply a striking figure of rhetoric has come to our aid; the prophet has given us an impressive scene in his vision, which, in free poetic rendering, may describe any season of the general prevalence of bitterness of feeling among those who ought to be brethren—who ought to be drinking joyously at the unpolluted waters of the fountain of life. A time when bitterness seems to fall out of sky; when the Star Wormwood sheds its baleful influence upon the streams that come out from the city of our God; when an absinthian curse has poisoned the very well-springs of salvation, so that men drinking thereof must lie down and die—the imagery of the prophet evidently means a time like that, and upon such a time we seem to have come.

Without being dark-minded or croaking in our habit, we must take note of the sad fact of a very wide-spread "wormwood" blight in the Christian world—an alienation of feeling—the bitterness of many factions at war about many things. We must not, of course, deepen the shadows of this unhappy picture, and we are, therefore, early cautioned that our apocalyptic figure may be on too large a scale. The caution is good. Let us not exaggerate, but by all means let us tell the truth.

There is probably not a denomination in Christendom that is

not at this moment turmoiling in some sort of intestine war. It is not now as it has often been before—after a sharp clash of opinion, or the sparring of eminent leaders in theological debate, nuclei of new organizations would be formed, and the factions would fall off into schismatic segregation and self content. The times have changed, or rather we are in the new experiences of a transition state. We have come to see that the disintegration of sect has reached its limit, and that whatever exigency it may have subserved in the past development of the polity and doctrine of the Christian Church, the necessity no longer exists, and that in this direction, at least, the openings for the spirit of schism are finally closed. Ambitious leaders cannot flaunt a new flag, as aforetime, and rally men and money to the support of the new tenet, as against the equally zealous rivalries of countless others in the field. The spiritual sensitivity of Christendom has become quickened so far as to see, that disintegration is not the law of the kingdom, and that strife among brethren must have some other redress. Whether from the emphatic whisperings of the Spirit of God, or the painful chafings of common sense, the decree seems to have gone forth that denominational separatism is displeasing to the Master, and all divisive agencies are under his ban. Thus far, and no farther—this is the Master's edict to a dismembered church. Here is, indeed, the great ecclesiastical fact of our age—the organic crumbling of its spiritual forces has ceased, and there are the beginnings of a new synthesis of dissipated energies in the direction of the all swaying life of our common Lord.

Good, so far—but what if we shall discover the incitations for our “wormword era” in the very uncertainties and confusions of the new time we are hailing, when men are shocked and exasperated at the failure of old methods, and the toppling of long-endearred systems of thought, and are unable to adjust themselves peaceably to the changed order of things?

The peculiar embarrassment is something like this. The ardor for some special dogma, or system of dogma, that gave rise to the sect has died away—the early fires of enthusiasm have burnt themselves out—and, looking on down the line, it is discovered, that all the historic differences among the denomina-

ations, of whatever kind, and burning with whatever vehemence of unbrotherly rancor in the day they were born, have for this generation become practically inert, while the vast machinery through which they work, shaped and controlled by the sect-life for ends of propagandism in whatever direction conquests could be made—this machinery must roll on, hereafter, with its meaning dropt out. We all see the dilemma. A religious denomination has no right to exist, except upon the assumption that its discoveries in divine truth, or its fundamental reforms of creed and cultus, entitle it to be considered pre-eminently the Church of God. Before it all others must give way. If it be not the veriest sham of pharisaism, its distinctive tenets are an advanced claim to precedence among all other organizations bearing the name, and its machinery of propagandism may fairly make conquests of these, as it may of the world. But suppose that in the process of disintegration another faction may drop off, and another, and another—each erecting for itself some exclusive title to be considered pre-eminently the Church of God—there is, then, the war of the sects, a long and bloody war, desolating, often, the fair fields of Christendom with fire and sword.

Meantime the rival churches have had their competing methods of gathering in the masses—mostly of an emotional kind—as if, in the end, the Master were to say, "Well done" to that organization, whose proselyting machinery was most fruitful of results. On this machinery the imprint of the sect was most distinctly impressed. Sensational methods, appealing to the grosser religious impulses of the human soul, and coercive in their importunity, were everywhere resorted to in the churches, and had become imbedded in the very economy of church life with an institutional hold.

Now it is in this quarter, I think, that we are to witness the first internal disturbance when the era of reaction has come on—when the folly of denominational separatism has become everywhere apparent, and yet this system of evangelism, grown colossal in its proportions, and hallowed by the tenderest associations, must run on without the necessary fuel to keep it aglow. What was to be done? Denominational ardor having subsided,

these emotional methods were shorn of their zeal. Their historic necessity seemed to have expired; their day was past. But things were on such a scale in this direction as to involve the turbulence of a revolution in rolling back the tide; and conservative leaders were embittered and chagrined at the intimation, even, that the great "revival era" had past. It was worldliness that was rolling in its muddy deluge around the altars of God, they said, and the fires of the sanctuary were extinguished in the engulfing slime. There was some truth in this lament, but devout and thoughtful spirits, skilled in interpreting the signs of the times, had consented to say that the revival era had past, because the instigations and zeal of denominational separatism were no longer alive.

Here was, already, a strong provocation to intestine broil, and those standing aloof from the fervid stirrings of the evangelists in the stagnant pool, were written down on the list of the proscribed, as those who had lapsed from the faith and were hopelessly infected with a worldly taint. Much alienation of feeling, much confusion, and a prodigal squandering of spiritual resource, was the painful incident of this unhappy time. But at last, with much reluctance, those most tenacious of the old order were compelled to give over, and to speak feelingly of the great revival era as a Pentacostal cycle now practically at an end.

But it is easy for us, now, to see, that this exhaustion of method was only symptomatic of vaster changes going on in the very heart of the life of the Church, touching the doctrinal principles and creed-formulas, out of which this stupendous fabric of partizan Christianity took its rise. Incisions are to be made here, and long cherished convictions, upon which our religious life for all these years had been eagerly feeding, are to be thrust through, and perhaps the very foundations of our Christian certitude are to be set at naught. How sensitive this point is we all know, who have had the very eye of our faith thrust at by gleaming instruments leaping dextrously in the direction of the vital ray. For some wise end the solicitations of religion are strongest in human nature, its affinities deepest, its loves and antipathies most intense, and, therefore, its fanaticisms are fierce, its animosities implacable, and its prejudices most dif-

ficult to be overcome. There is room here for the Star Wormwood, in the widest range of its absinthian distillings, over all the fountains and rivers of salvation, to make them as bitter as gall. When failure or desuetude at last falls on any system of agencies built up through years of heroic endeavor, and learning, and sacrifice, and bloody sweat—when the wheels will no longer run, and the fire-pits refuse to be kindled into their wonted glow—the moment of disappointment invites the active-minded to look into the cause, and to suspect some error lying far back at the fountain head. The provisional was not the permanent, and now that it has come to its stubborn date, it was inevitable that the seed of the perishable should be hunted up in the dark, and that the whole system should be ransacked and revised, with the view of reclaiming it at the point at which it was found to be weak.

What actually took place, and is now in the process of going on, we may venture only in the faintest outline to indicate or discuss. The evangelical denominations sprang into existence, for the most part, under stimulus of divergent ideas of the grace of God in the recovery of the guilty race of mankind from the curse of sin. All agreed that the mission of Christ to our earth had this in view—his incarnation, his miracles, his teaching, his death on the cross, his resurrection, and the reign of his Spirit now all over the world. They all agreed that the new life was engendered in the soul of man by the Spirit of God, somehow working through a series of writings they all consented to regard as the inspired repository of divine truth, the only infallible rule of faith and life. The points in which they disagreed, with minor differences, were with reference to the manner in which the divine Spirit wrought its efficacy on the souls of men, and the precise limit and function of the means of grace in the economy of redemption so imposingly and solemnly set up in the world.

The largest generalization we can make in the doctrinal divergencies of denominational Christianity, will indicate them as taking three general lines of direction; first, toward the sovereignty of the divine movement in the recovery of man; second, toward the larger exercise of man's free agency in co-op-

erating with the Spirit of God; and, third, toward the inter-mediating function of the sacraments and the Church, as the divinely ordained channels through which the grace of God is communicated to men. When numberless schools of theology were found to be at war on these deep matters, and the great general bodies of the Reformation were breaking up in finer and finer sect communions, a new question arose as to the sources of authority for spiritual truth, as to how far experience was to be relied on as settling the validity of any matter to be believed, how far the word of God was to be the final court of appeal, and, finally, what rank in conserving sound doctrine the ecumenical confessions were to have. The word of God by all means, but to what extent may these other elements enter in the voice of the Church, the witness of the Spirit, the dictates of enlightened reason—what hand may they take in settling an arbitration between you and me?

Our task withholds us from any discussion, on their merits, of the points at issue among the litigant churches; we aim simply at observing the condition of things when Christendom became conscious of the failure of its methods, and a panic drove the theologians back upon the citadel of their faith. Imagine the churches halting in their differences, and recognizing collectively the two-fold fact, first, that their differences no longer annoy, and, second, that the vast machinery of denominational propagandism has ceased to work. At this point further imagine the spiritual forces, so long having vent in channels of enthusiasm now run dry, thrown back in confusion upon themselves, and in troubled inquiry as to the very sources whence they spring—imagine a hurrying to and fro, a rush now upon this, and now upon that, of the old landmarks, that were thought to have the pledge of the eternities that they should remain undisturbed—a sense of the giving away of the ground beneath our feet, and our very household toppling from the undermining of those whom we thought to be the boon companions of our hearth—in this way you may get some conception of the baleful plunging of the "Wormwood Star." But imagining a condition of things may have nothing in reality to correspond, and it behooves us, therefore, to trace up these reactions—these cur-

rents and counter currents of the religious fermentation of our time—with some degree of discernment as to the actual facts in the case.

It will be conceded, I think, that Puritanism is the aggressive branch of the Reformation forces of Protestant Christianity—in the lead, always, in the fervor of its evangelistic industries, and in the ardor with which its pietistic measures were carried into effect. Its great tenet of the sovereignty of God had in it the ring of a conqueror, the clash, so to speak, of invincible armies moving upon the world, and subduing the very civilizations of the time to its secular behoof. “God sovereign and man free”—it was in that famous formula that the Calvinistic theologians, in the name of the religion of Jesus, attempted the synthesis of the divine and human in that all baffling problem with which the philosophers and sages of the past had wrestled in vain—and with which they also wrestled in vain, except that they wrought out for the system a stern individualism which has given character to the entire religious and social fabric of our modern time. Man is amenable only to God; all men are so amenable; and each man for himself has direct and unobstructed access to the Lord God and Saviour with whom he has to do—none daring to molest him or make him afraid.

God sovereign suggested the “decrees,” and it was fitting that these should have been fashioned and promulgated in the counsels of eternity before the foundations of the world, getting a chosen people for God’s own, out of the apostate myriads that should be swarming on our planet, and passing the others by. The Spirit of God, whose office it is to carry out these decrees, must himself also be sovereign, and, therefore, no human effort or condition, the observance of no form, no bendings or pleadings in the exercise of penitential frames, could fairly be said to invite his renewing offices with the souls of his own. The sovereign Spirit was to try no doubtful experiments with man—it was “in his own time and place,” *ubi et quando visum est Deo*, in the language of the creed, that he was to arrest the sinner, and bring him in powerless penitence to the foot of the cross.

It will be seen that out of this philosophy of the plan of salvation the “revival methods” will shoot up as from their native

root, that they are indigenous here, whilst they are more or less exotic everywhere else. There is, indeed, enough Augustinianism in all the creeds to make these methods of easy introduction into all the evangelical churches, besides the fact that all men, always, take their first lessons in religion, in that presentation of it in which their emotions are most readily touched. The great Spirit was abroad with evident prerogative to kill and make alive; he would light down upon the careless, and all at once the fires of judgment were kindled in their track. The rebel was cut down. The solemn moment, carrying in it the destinies of an immortal soul in a world without end, had come, and whether, with one party, the call was held to be effectual and irresistible, because it was made by the sovereign Spirit of God, or, with another, that it might be repeatedly and even finally resisted and adjourned, yet here was the awful fact of a supernatural power breaking into the experiences of men, and subjecting their eternal destiny to the hazard of an instantaneous risk. In either case the process was the same, or, rather, the great transaction, whereby the soul was passed from death unto life, had its moment of consummation, whether men knew it or not, and the divine agent wrought in its own name, and certain special experiences, more or less clearly defined, were held without question as attesting the event.

Almost everywhere in Christendom, the idea of instantaneous regeneration by the Spirit of God had such wide and ardent acceptance, that the revival system, when once originated, passed rapidly beyond its Puritanic habitat, and was caught up by the pietistic reactionists in the sacramental churches as well, and applied by these with even more enthusiasm and demonstration than in their original home. The great Methodist communities began in this way, being a reaction against the rigid sacramentalism of the English Church; and, in like manner, the pietistic movement in Lutheran circles, as represented by Spener and Franke in Germany and by the learned and devout Muhlenberg in this country—a zealous revolt against the protracted confessionalism and formalism of the mother church.

But as the years go by, in the development of Christian doctrine, it comes to pass that this *sovereignty* idea of God, and the

conception of his administration of grace under juridical analogies—an unchallenged potentate and judge, doing as seemeth him good among the armies of heaven and with the children of men—this idea, the original inspiration of revivalistic zeal, gradually loses its hold, and with its decline the whole fabric of traditional theology hastens on to fundamental readjustment and change.

As it was in this country that denominational Christianity found an open field, and the largest liberty in working out the problem it had to solve, it is here in the main, that we are to witness the confusions incident to the time of the breaking up of the old, and the coming on of the new. Nevertheless the influences contributing to this result are world-wide in their operation, and are the inevitable concomitant of the march of mind. Thus, outside of theology—itself an attempt at the realization of scientific methods in sacred things—there is the imposing spectacle of science itself mounting to a place of intellectual and social supremacy in the thinking of the age, and, amid a blaze of utilitarian discovery, threatening to carry its materialistic formula over into every phase of human interest and experience, and denouncing as folly every attempt to transcend the boundary of our finite liberty in space and time. Science in the higher ranges of its speculative bearings comes to be a species of materialistic philosophy, dealing, as all philosophy must, with the substratum of things, with whatever that is in which all sensible phenomena inhore. It feels out to find that which lies beyond—that which eludes the observation of man, but which dimly reports itself as somehow limiting the capacity of the human mind to embrace. Science has had much to do in hovering around this point, with prodigious toil and ingenuity seeking to reduce it to the negative emptiness of a metaphysical inane, and at the same time setting it up with such pomp of circumstance, and parade of verbal nothingness, as to demand for it the replacing of the Christian's God.

And yet, we should have no hesitation in confessing it, agnosticism is the stupendous intellectual phenomenon of our day, marshaling a larger array of formidable forces against all supernaturalism, and specifically against that on which the Christian

religion avowedly rests, than was ever combined to the same end before, making a season of most dangerous emergency for the long cherished principles of our traditional faith. Materialistic philosophy became confident that it had demonstrated that there was no God, in the Christian sense of that term, but there was the Unknowable, a negative abstraction, which to the inherent religious impulses of men, must become a kind of cloudy deity of awe-inspiring emptiness—at that point at which the methods of science were stricken with impotency in the presence of the mystery of the world. The attack on Christian theism from this quarter was so sweeping and self-assured—all the sciences, new and old, like an army with banners, surrounding the beleaguered citadel of our faith—that the theologians of all schools were compelled to neglect the distinctive differences of their creeds, and rally to its defence.

The stress of that critical moment for the religion of Jesus has gone by, but there has perceptibly fallen to this generation a deep and pervasive reorganization of its old-time beliefs. The doctrine of God, as it had been organically interwoven into the logical system of the Calvinistic faith, and which was imbedded with less coherence in all other Reformation creeds, was found to be weighted down with a burden of anthropomorphisms, which were damaging *impedimenta* in the impending perils of a heated campaign. Thus, for example, the idea of God as a *sovereign*, though the only sovereign—leaving the boon of democracy to all his struggling children alike on earth—had all too much in it of the belligerent reminiscences of Huguenot and Scotch wars, and the cherubic lightnings of Cromwell's sword. It was the Hebrew God—and not the Nazarene God walking with paternal tenderness through the mortuary shadows of our disciplinary estate, thus fixing the image of the divine Father upon the blurred and groping vision of effete religious feeling after God, and lifting humanity as a whole to the dignity of conscious sonship in the measureless love of the Father as witnessed in him—it was, obviously, not distinctly this God of the gospels that was nestling at the heart of the venerable creeds. It was God as potentate, God seated on a throne from which were fulminating the fires of judgment upon a rebellious

race of purblind and miserable men God executing decrees, and carrying on the government of the world above the contingency of finite happening, and against the insurrectionary purposes of men—it was this anthropomorphic conception of God which gave logical consistency to the whole system, and secured to every proposition in it, its specific meaning and value as an integral portion of the orthodox faith. Practically it was an absentee God, that, after the manner of the old mythologies, sat on the rim of the world, and dispensed his distant administrations through the *ubi et quando* of his sovereign Spirit, going and coming at the bidding of his will.

Too wholly transcendent was this God of the Westminster divines—shrouded quite inaccessible in the awful solitudes of the eternal world, and if caught at all by the straining vision of faith, always interpreted by the royal insignia of crown and throne. The God of the gospels—the infinite loving Father—was not there, or, if there, always in the pageantry of the King of kings. We were come upon an epoch when the intellectual and spiritual exigencies of the religion we defended, and the very movement of the thought of the age itself, required a prompt recognition of a God *immanent* in the world he had made—the all-sufficing life and synthesis of the finite universe of matter and mind—and that the Jesus of the gospels be clearly identified with this immanent God. This must be done; there is no escape; all the deepest thinking of the age was concurrent and coercive to this end. The "Progressive Orthodoxy" of one of the theological centers of this country essayed that task, by bringing in from Germany the ample scholarly material ready furnished there for their use.

But we may easily conceive how an adventure of this kind would make a wide opening for the reign of the "bitter star." To the conservative mind it was a movement of iconoclastic violence upon all the fundamental tenets of the orthodox faith—not simply the meretricious statement of "old truths under a new light," but a radical rupture with the evangelical system as a whole. In the first place, the new theism, it was thought, betrayed manifest symptoms of the old disease of pantheism,

making sad havoc, always, of the moral and spiritual elements of any religion upon which its baleful shadow should alight. An immanent divinity in the souls of men—what effect must this have on our traditional ideas of the revelation of God in Christ, on the incarnate mystery, coming out, as we thought, from the eternities on a chariot of miracle, and making the dim segment of our terrestrial experience in the same chariot, onward through the shadows, and back again into the bosom of God? Is it not the tendency of this idea, as a central force, so to reduce and dilute our old-time conception of the divinity of Christ as to leave him no longer “God of God, Light of Light, true God of the true God,” but simply an anomalous exhibition of the infinite *quantum* of divinity inhering in every man—a religious prodigy flaming in the circuit of our years?

And even when, as a corrective, this school calls us back with emphasis to the historic Christ, to witness in him the personal manifestation of the immanent God—to see the infinite Father coming into apprehension in the infinite Son—according as he himself hath said, “As the Father hath life in himself, even so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself”—still there seems to go with this, also, an incalculable loss from the old absolutism of the ecumenical creeds. Thus predestination, a doctrine lying at the heart of Genevan orthodoxy—the foreordination of an elect people to the favor of God through the voluntary offering of the Son in satisfying the demands of a violated law—a peculiar heritage, the reward of the Son’s sacrifice, at the time of the harvest which is the end of the world—and “*preterition*,” the passing of the others by—this central doctrine, in order to take on the paternal aspect of the new views struggling into place, must be so far revolutionized as to seem to its old adherents to have nothing of its original consistency left. It is the Father, now, and not the unchallenged sovereign canvassing the details of his triune administration in the solitudes of eternity before the worlds were; the Father manifesting himself in the Son, and, co-ordinately, the essential sonship of every soul of man—obviously this view of the incarnate mystery must threaten the very foundations of the Calvinistic creed. The metamorphosis is radical, and must propagate itself through

the whole body of divinity, as the waves of the sea beat on the most distant shore. Nothing can escape, sin, atonement, regeneration, the office of the Spirit, the function of the word of God, providence, judgment, and the final allotments of the eternal world—every venerable tenet of the evangelical faith must witness to the cup of trembling administered by an alien hand. So it seems. A third part of Christendom must drink of the distillings of the “wormwood star.”

For were not the leading minds in this movement guilty of a breach of trust? Had they not first solemnly sworn, as preachers, to dispense the pure word of God as formulated in the creed of the church they were to serve: and, then, becoming teachers of preachers, in a theological foundation anchored by the very terms of its incorporation to the steadfast maintenance of the distinctive tenets of the traditional faith, were they not doubly bound to stand by that faith, and doubly perjured when they consented to let it go? As a matter of fact, there came to pass the long embroilings of a trial in the civil courts, with the result of the so-called heresy still nestling in the bosom of the church, and its acquitted right, in the liberty of the Gospel, to do that very thing. The confusions that follow are painful to note—wild, tentative, panic-driven, like as when

“Even on Arthur fell  
Confusion, since he saw not whom he fought,  
For friend and foe were shadows in the mist,  
And friend slew friend not knowing whom he slew”

excepting that something more than the mist that overhung the “great battle in the west” is, in this case, the responsible cause.

In the new mode of thinking the mercy of God, the love of the Father for his wayward children, as in the story of the Prodigal Son, is likely to get beyond the restricted limits and rigid conditions of the unchangeable decree, and run out with some degree of spontaneous overflow to the returning wanderer, albeit with belated footsteps, making finally for his father's house. The love of God, so long tethered to his justice, may range we know not where, in a system which professes to see it going forth to the rescue of men in its own name, and dispensing itself in impartial fulness, like the sunlight, to every opening

susceptibility in human souls. In this way the love of God may become a libertine love, before which the whole probationary aspect of our life in this world must disappear, and the moral order of the universe itself be broken down. Accordingly the new eschatology becomes the theatre of a prolonged and bitter war—as to whether redemptive processes may not in some sense, overleap the bounderies of our earthly estate; whether the heathen, for example, may not have their salvable opportunity in the other world.

It was sad evidence of the precipitate temper of the minds of men in a religious panic, that this point of emergence for the new theology should have been singled out for attack, first, because in all schools of orthodox Christian dogma some scheme of restorative mercy in the other world—some presentation of Christ, and the possible acceptance of him, on the part of those who in this world had never the opportunity of hearing his name—has been habitually set forth as, at least, a corollary to the revealed plan of salvation operative with those unto whom the Gospel has come; and second, because this phase of the new teaching was by no means its vital point. But the great Missionary Societies gave the note of alarm. Any hint of probationary opportunity in the other world, for the heathen, for example, would seem to make all effort for their evangelization unwise and superfluous, nay, worse, precipitate for them a crisis of responsibility that had been far better deferred to the higher conditions and less doubtful issues of the eternal world. It were not well to attempt to do for them, in this world, what were under vastly safer provision for more generous realization in the next. In this way the new doctrine and the great commission were made to lock horns, and it was held that the missionary zeal of the Christian Church, which the great commission had identified with its life, was in this way poisoned at its source. This will account, in part at least, for the long and bitter struggle round a theological outpost, of little strategic importance as compared with the condensed centers of movement now in preparation for the onset of the coming times.

Of much more significance, as striking in the direction of those centers, was the attempt to revise the old creed, at that

point in it, in which the new theology found occasion for mortal offence. In that old creed the love of God had been a forgotten term. The paternal element—this that lies in such beauty of compassion over all the four gospels in their unstinted opulence of touching detail—this tearful gathering of revolted children, as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings—this, for some cause, had been strangely omitted, or with much logical entanglement verbally sequestered and slurred. The dominant thought of the Confession was, the unmerited mercy of God, saving itself from waste, in an economy of grace which gathered back to him the unfailing number of his elect—a doctrine deeply rooted in Pauline analogy and *discursus*, and enlarging its prestige with the names of saintly advocates from Augustine on down—but going with it, was the revolting tenet of “*preterition*,” the doctrine that the goodness of God in fore-ordaining the elect had, in the same eternal moment and purpose, passed the others by. This would seem to say, that there was a large overplus of human beings whom the great Creator had doomed to perdition before they were born, or, what would amount to the same thing, that these unfortunate creatures were made for the reprobate destiny to which they were finally consigned.

It is the unhappy characteristic of all human creeds, that they are so largely open to sophistical handling by those who are skilled in logical tergiversation and verbal finesse, that not unfrequently from complementary clauses in the same sentence, hostile schools of theology will pit themselves in deadly debate. It is “yes” and “no”—a question of grappling construction on the very same words. So here—the offensive doctrine had long been held up by the prestidigitator’s skill, by the scholastic expedient of having “yes” and “no” plant themselves on exactly the same ground. The reprobate were predestined to perdition, and then, in another aspect of the subject, they were not. It is hardly to be wondered at, that the stanchest advocate of the Confession should at last give over, in case of a revolting doctrine susceptible only of ambiguous support, and turn with his revision scalpel on the consecrated clauses that were breeding the offense. But we have, here, another illustration of the

"mounting in hot haste," the rush, the fluster, the laying hold to, and letting go, so characteristic of the panic-driven mind, when one great branch of the Church rises up, almost in mass, to carve from its Confession this schism-engendering clause, and all others neglecting or beclouding the infinite love of God —rises up, and—as suddenly sits down.

Come to face the matter, insuperable difficulties were in the way. How cut out the subordinate clause without having the principal clause fatally involved? Here was a system of theology, the first in the ages, perhaps, built up with flawless coherence of parts, and the strong arm of logic molding every proposition to its place, blessing and approving every step of it with the confirmation of a text—how draw the pen over a single clause of it, without marring the symmetry of the whole, nay, without thrusting through, as with a spear, the very principle on which the whole is based? Election and reprobation—the two ideas logically interlace, or rather, the one is by necessary implication the inseparable negative complement of the other. There are a dozen apples on one bough, the purpose to reach forth and pluck six of them is, by implication, the purpose to allow the other six to remain. So, therefore, the calmer moment made it manifest, that the hand that was lifted against the offending fragment, must fall with damaging ruin upon the whole fabric of elective grace; and already it was observed that many hands were twitching nervously in the direction of that desperate deed. Moreover, consider for a moment what it is to revise a creed. This thing came from the hands of the framers, for them at least, a living thing, having in it an individual organic life of its own, the shape in which the spiritual experience of a great company of heroic spirits threw itself, in time of imminent religious peril, as the oak configures its branches in battling with the storm. It grew up in the religious and secular environment of the age in which it was made—from the peculiar trials, and insights, and scholarly questions, and sharp doctrinal clashing, of a stalwart race of theologians who beat mightily, with strong wing, against mediaeval darkness at that time just lifting from the minds of men. It is, therefore, a species of intellectual sacrilege to tamper with their work. Re-

vision is mutilation, no matter how skilfully done, and practically suborns these dead men to say what they did not intend. This must be given up; but, alas, what other timely thing is there that may be amicably dome? The waters in this quarter, also, are tasting of the bitter star, and there are grave apprehensions that the prophet's imprecation may come to pass: "Behold, I will feed them, even this people, with wormwood, and give them the water of gall to drink."

But scarcely has the defeat transpired when a new trouble breaks in from the stormy sky—this time threatening a danger far beyond and within the human intrenchments that theologians have thrown up—even what seems to be an assault, by its own garrison, on the very citadel of divine truth itself. The new theology had been laying its measuring reed closely to the jasper foundations of the spiritual city; the time had come to consider well the measuring reed itself. On what ground of authority does the supernatural religion of Jesus rest; what is to be the ultimate verification of its alleged facts; in the emergency of the failure of all human buttresses of belief, on what rampart of rock may it hold out against the utmost storm and stress of our troublous times? It is evident that the unformulated confidence of the individual disciple, the unsailing well-spring of his Christian experience, will not suffice—there must be some oracle to which the whole world may appeal, to which the learned man, the man of science, the philosopher, the critic, may bring the last discovery of his trained faculty, and find nothing at fault.

Hitherto Protestant Christianity had been resting with unclouded unanimity on the Bible as the word of God, and "the only infallible rule of faith and practice"—the authoritative ultimate reference, therefore, in all spiritual matters at any time subject to the honest scrutiny of inquiring minds. Aforetime, the infallible stronghold was lodged in the Church, in papal investiture, in the alleged continuity of apostolic prerogative on down the ages, the truth of God keeping its mouth-piece inside the sacerdotal ranks. With Luther all that was discarded, and the holy Scriptures were installed in its place. An infallible book supplanted an infallible Pope, and this, briefly was the religious Reformation with all the wealth of spiritual liberty and

uplifting it brought in its train. Infallible! that means a body of writings which makes no mistake in which there is no essential misplacing of facts, no conflict of statement, no insufficiency or unregulated excess in the exhibition of the truth—in short an inspired compend of the will and word of God, to which one might cling with as much confidence as to the incarnate person of the Lord himself. The Book was divine, not human, or, otherwise, the human was so plastic to the divine, as to have dropt its visible identity from the sacred page.

But meantime vast schools of learned inquiry have sprung up in the domain of the linguistic sciences and archæological research, and men of acute intellects and phenomenal resource have unearthed the secrets of the antique world, and read the history of the times in which these writings were produced, almost with the eyes of those times. Philology with its allied branches is, indeed, the learned miracle of our age. We need scarcely be surprised, then, that Christian Apologetics, gathering up the enormous tributary material coming in from these countless sources, and converging it upon the far-back origins of the sacred text, should assume an aspect somewhat threatening to the habitual security of the old-time traditional view of the inspired Word. By a hard stroke of audacious utterance on the part of one of the leading Biblical critics of the age—needlessly foward and pugnacious, it would seem—the public mind was aroused to the necessity of examining well the claims of this Book, under the flood of recent information pouring in from the past, especially as all the skeptical forces of the new era of science were massing their destructive enginery against this last great stronghold of the Christian faith.

The blow though startling and belligerent, was not unkind. Protestant Christianity was resting with its whole weight on this Book. Assuredly, now, there can be no safety in putting forward a claim for this Book which cannot be made good; the best thing in the world must be found to be the most real; therefore the anchor of reality in tempestuous seas must stay our hopes within the veil. Moreover here was an illustration of a vast subject, perhaps more vitally connected with the fortunes of the religion of Jesus than any other, so transcending

the grosser offices of creed-formula and standards of belief, as to have no authorized expression in any of these, except, of course, the general affirmation that the Holy Scriptures are the inspired word of God. What inspiration is, how the divine afflatus wrought with the writer when he coined his message into the language of man, to what extent he was clothed thereby with an immunity against error, and to what extent the same inspiration became surely for the subsequent preservation of his work—of all this there was no well-digested utterance in the standards of faith. And there could not be, the time was not mature, and it is somewhat doubtful whether the subtle matter can ever be amenable to any other than a subjective test.

The Reformers who were busied with the stupendous work of Bible restoration, and who were often painfully cognizant of the wilderness of perplexity waylaying the purity of the text, and of the uncertainties of clerical transcription, and of the diversity of readings in all the most ancient manuscripts accessible to their search—knew these things as well, though not by any means so amply, as the learned Biblical critics of our day—with them the *free* doctrine of inspiration was frankly avowed, and, both as to authenticity and canonicity, they could see no fatal infirmity in a subjective test. Calvin held that the Spirit of God witnessed with the spirit of the devout reader, by a kind of inbreathing perception of the inspiration and divinity of what he read, making the authority of the Church unnecessary and all questions of authorship, in the nature of the case, of minor interest, to one who had tasted of the higher quality inhering in the page. Luther's somewhat larger view of the *organic function* of the books, their uniform drift and harmony to the same end, involved a like principle—that these Scriptures were self-evidencing in their inspiration, as they more or less remotely clustered about the person of Christ, of whose divine effluence the reader is presumed beforehand to have measurably shared. It was afterward, when communion of soul with these Scriptures was less interior and direct, that the theory of verbal and mechanical inspiration became current in the Churches—originated in an era of dogma, when deadly controversies were

to be settled by an array of isolated proof-texts, the *ipsissima verba* from the mouth of God himself. Such a theory could not stand. The rising tide of Rationalism swept it entirely away—made it manifest to Christian scholars, that the theory of verbal inerrancy of the Scriptures was untenable in the premises, and a rampart of reeds against the violence and discipline of the destructive criticism of that age.

My aim now is, not to canvass so great a matter on its merits, but to discover the occasion, if possible, of that strange asperity of feeling and sudden outburst of heresy hunting impulse, which signalized the somewhat ungracious announcement of the legitimate fruits of Apologetics on this wide and embarrassing field. This was the state of the case. The mind of Christendom, in an era of polemics, had fixed itself upon the letter of the Scriptures, as an external source of authority beyond which there was no appeal. An opponent was to be vanquished by a “thus saith the Lord”—putting proof-texts to him with a greater or less precision of aim, these proof-texts being regarded, by both parties in the conflict, as the very words of God himself. This is an easy and fascinating view of the dear and blessed words of a Book—the Book of Books—a Book which is clearly entitled to be considered the word of God. But the age of polemics subsided, and left the popular mind in the quiet eddy of that comfortable view, while, meantime, the age of rationalism came on, and swept the scholarly leaders out into the flood. In this memorable contest the Holy Scriptures were saved, by abandoning the rigid, mechanical, post-Reformation view, and developing the *free* view of inspiration, which finds in these marvelous records a continuous line of theanthropic revelation, on through the ages, and breaking in glory over the cloudy limits of the letter, and the dim contingencies of the hoary years, and culminating in the full splendors of the incarnate Son of man.

This view discovered an immense advantage in conceding the limitations and instability of the letter, while engaging to rest the divinity of the writings on the demonstrable presence of the incarnate and personal Word, in legible tracing throughout the whole, and adjudging a scale of values to them, severally, ac-

cording as that image was here and there the more vividly expressed. The advantage was incalculable, when Christianity came to face a new enemy in the materialistic philosophy and scientific scepticism of our contemporary time,—an enemy that was blatant over the grotesque sloughings of effete dogmas, as though they were now the current convictions of an unprogressive church. Here was an immeasurable gain, of which, however, the general mind was not aware, the full import of which had not yet gone abroad, and which had no incentive to herald itself until brought into close grapple with this contemporary and most formidable foe. Then the adventurous blow was struck—we know with what wide-spread alarm, and even terror to the general mind, as if in that blow the Master had been cruelly wounded in the house of his friends. There must be treason in the camp. The panic grew. The longer, the worse.

I presume we must grant a wise providence in the extreme sensitivity of the conservative conscience in the Christian Church—it is often a timely obstruction thrown in the way of a maddening flood. But there is a conservative frenzy, as well as the hurly-burly of inconsiderate dash. And as a matter of fact, in the case before us, the dash of the scholarly Professor was well and deliberately planned from behind the deeply grounded, impregnable defenses of the word of God, whilst the belated ostracisms of his impatient brethren were visibly reminiscent of the “Wormwood Star.”

But not to delay, we turn in other directions only to see the acrid waters flowing and rankling everywhere. We have no habit of being dark-minded or pessimistic, have no sympathy with that desponding spirit that doubts for a moment the ultimate triumph of the kingdom of our Lord, but it is disingenuous and misleading to slur over an evil condition of things, and, for the sake of a confident seeming in the presence of our enemies, to put a fair face on that which is not fair. We must not do it. The true and false are opposites, and it is, perhaps, the most obtrusive symptom of the spiritual decadence of our times, that in the heat of ecclesiastical rivalries, and in the mild name of evangelism, things are said and done by zealous leaders in the Church which would not be counted even moral in the enemy's

camp. There is no loss, certainly—there may be infinite gain, in looking at the facts.

A large body of American Christendom is of sacramental antecedents in the old world—coming to the new world in a frame of pietistic reaction against the formalism of the old. These fall in with the rising tide of emotional ardors everywhere beating on these shores—in two lines of tendency, let us say; the one retaining its strong sacerdotal organization from sources in the English Church; the other, from Germany, losing almost the recollection of the sacramental feature of its creed, in its eagerness to promote evangelical piety among those who might come under its sway—neither party stopping to trace the roots of the new methods to their indigenous origin in the Puritanic faith. It was enough to know, that what was wanting in the penitent was true contrition of heart, and whole-souled unre-served surrender to the pardoning and renewing agency of the Spirit of God. With scarcely any direct aid from dogma, these went on plying vigorously the emotional methods which were current everywhere, as if, indeed, these methods were somehow the essential and imperishable embodiment of the aggressive life of the Church. They were at once the boon and badge of evangelism—a fatal line, on the hither side of which all was spiritual bloom and beauty, whilst beyond was an arid region of unbroken religious formalism and death. But history is wiser than the men who make it, and the time came when the zeal for these methods ceased to burn. In the due course of things, the living creatures of the prophet's vision had to drop down from their stridulous soaring, and when they alighted on the ground "they let down their wings." Now it is to the confusions of this strange moment of the letting down of the wings, the bluster, the driving here and there of religious im-pulses seemingly lost in the calm, that we are to turn our attention, by way of accounting for the wide-spread embittering of the water of life.

In the one case, where the sacerdotal element was strong, and the organization was such as to take in and assimilate the material as fast as it was furnished to hand, there was, of course, an ecclesiasticism built up for the Church, which insured for it

an unrivaled position among its competitors in numbers, and wealth and social standing—so that, in the day of the letting down of the wings, there was no question of failing propagandism to distract its powers. But meantime, as in all sacerdotalism, whether appealing to a consecrated tenure or not, there sprang up a large and dominant spirit of dominion, which had many times rent the body into seceding factions, and which, now, on the subsidence of pristine zeal, may find an arena for its exercise in the vast business interests and complications of office that have grown with its growth. There is no war over doctrine—where business interests absorb there is not likely to be. But, as Dr. Dorner has shown, in such condition of church transformation “working societies” are often substituted for spiritual life. Worldly maxims come in to embroil, and although the great machinery of ecclesiasticism rolls on as before, dispensing millions of money in world-wide beneficence, and building a church for every day in the year, there is, nevertheless, a deep undertone of discontent, and a jarring consciousness that the world has brought in its distractions, where aforetime the world was devoutly shut out.

As to the other sacramental offshoot, the pietistic movement coming in from Germany, we have a simpler but sadder story to tell. There is no ecclesiasticism here, for the great Reformer, Martin Luther, whilst retaining a strong element of sacramentalism in the new views with which he startled the slumbering ages, nevertheless made conspicuous and fundamental in his system “the common priesthood of all the saints.” The new community was to be as democratic as that which clustered about the Master’s feet. Whatever accommodations of polity there might be to the changing conditions of times and place, there could never be a hierarchy of priestly function in this community—strictly speaking no priest at all—so long, at least, as the Scriptural basis of Luther’s great teaching should remain unimpaired. “One is your Master, and all ye are brethren”—that was enough.

Here was a strong bulwark against ecclesiasticism in the original church-consciousness of the parent stock of the Reformation, if only that great sentiment were not in discrepant associ-

ation with a clinging sacerdotal remnant of a by-gone age. Sacerdotalism always intrenches itself in some institutional stronghold of the external church. No sooner had the great Reformer, with his favorite idea of the communion of saints, dropt from his place in the world's affairs, than the sacramental features of his teaching, under the fostering environment of European church and-state affiliations, came to the front. Then followed what inevitably follows, on all attemps, however ingeniously undertaken, to exalt the letter above the spirit, the ordinances of the external church above the free spiritual life that should spontaneously circulate within—there followed a long age of formalism, and a sad eclipse of the great Reformer's work. The age of rationalism had its roots in this spiritual decline, in the midst of which there was a brief gleam of the old Reformer's spirit, in the Pietistic revival, that came and went like a refreshing shower in a time of drouth.

It was this movement, transplanted to the new world, that gave character to the Church of the Reformation on these shores. Here was a nation born in the heroic sacrifices of a refugee Puritan church, rocked in a Puritan cradle, baptized in Puritan blood freely poured out in the wilderness, for the glory of the coming Kingdom of God in these western wilds—and in the closing years of the eighteenth century—years of its robust adolescence—swept by an unprecedented visitation of revivalistic zeal. It was in the nature of Pietism—really a fugitive in like manner, from the religious persecutions of the old world—to yield its ardors in tributary volume, essentially the same in kind, to the tide of emotional interest sweeping through the land.

But we are to see this tide expend itself, and taste the bitterness of the runnels left in its track. At that moment the old cry of "*schwarmer*" ceased to be a taunt, and became, all at once, a reminder of years of fanatical wandering from the old-time confessional land-marks of the fathers—wanderings in the lead of Puritan vagaries, and the old Zwingli aberration, against which the great Reformer had set his face like flint. "Let us arise and go back," they said, "these Puritan methods are alien to the system and polity of the branch of Christendom we re-

present, and to the genius of the people whence we have come. Let us do our first works over again, and get back once more into our confessional home"—little reckoning what was meant by this loyal resolve. There were two seeds in the Reformer's system, destined, in the course of years, to grow up into two different trees, and there was to be an historic struggle as to which of the two should pre-empt the soil—two tendencies, distinctively, toward the pristine spiritual liberties of the primitive church, and toward the sacramental conservatism of the church gone by. Go back to which?

It was the delusion of the moment, that the Church in this country had not achieved an historic life of its own, that it was the cuckoo bird laying its eggs in another bird's nest, the hermit crab satisfied to be the tenant of a mollusk's shell. There was, indeed, a very wide gulf between the great Puritan doctrine of the direct movement of the Spirit of God on the souls of men, and any system of thinking which would make the sacraments a necessary intermediary to this end. It was a mistake however, that the exigency of the moment required a leap from the one position to the other—from exclusivism to exclusivism—from the direct sovereign ministrations of the Spirit of God, to its restricted sacramental intermediation in the divinely appointed ordinances of his Church.

In the first place it was not Puritanism that was alienating the Church from the sacramental moorings of its fathers. Pietism sprang up on German soil, and represented a powerful element in the experience and teaching of the great Reformer himself, and was exotic here, only in the sense that it had fled from its hostile half-brother in the Fatherland. Moreover Luther set forth, with great unction and power, the vital doctrine of the immediate agency of the Spirit of God with the souls of men, and often bubbled over with Methodistic ebullience in describing his own flashes of illumination while meditating devoutly on the Word of Life. There was a deep vein of mysticism in this remarkable man's experience, the quality in him, if we could but measure it adequately, that enabled him to re-discover and restore the sanctified individualism of the primitive Church—the fires that burn in the soul, when it comes in immediate contact

with its glorified Master, its love and its life. This ran in full current against the sacramental limitations of the old Church, and, but for their strong intrenchment in the devout associations of the early life of the Reformer, they would have been swept entirely away.

Really in Luther's system of thinking there was but one essential channel for the grace of God, and that was the truth, the precious and indestructible words of life, which he was instrumental in bringing back to the Church, and installing in a place of unchallenged supremacy over everything else. Only he seemed not to see that the truth and the Spirit of Truth, the Paraclete, were essentially one and the same thing—not a channel for grace, but the very agency of grace itself, and that to speak of the sacraments as channels of grace was necessarily to compromise the indefeasible prerogative of the Spirit of Truth. Moreover, to clothe the sacraments with anything other than a tutorial office—a conspiring with the Spirit of Truth in leading into all truth—were in effect to put them into the place of the Spirit of Truth, and in the end to limit the grace of God, and the devout reciprocations of the worshiper, to these concrete occasions and conditions only narrowly and sparingly accessible to all the world. If these are indispensable to salvation, in any intelligent use of that term, it must follow of necessity the Gospel is bound, and not free, and all trace of the unstinted compassion of the Master, and his overflowing tenderness to the unchurched masses, is lost in the rigid ritual he unhappily left in his place.

But I must not argue the case—my talk being limited to the exhibition of the dangerous besetments of a time of religious ferment, and the groping experiments of the panic stricken forces of Christendom, reaching out in their confusion to find the rock from which they have been dislodged. It behooves me however, to say that no theological wars have been more disastrous to the spiritual life of the Church, than those which have been waged around this fatal dogma of sacramental grace, and, therefore, it is no wonder that there should be ominous plungings of the baleful star, at the very thought of an ecclesiastical reversion to the old battle-fields scathed and riven by so many

death-dealing bolts of war. Go back to this? It cannot be. Meantime the waters are bitter—O, how bitter—and the Star, Wormwood, is having its way. Is there no friendly counsel that might be whispered into the solitude of our troublous times; may we not find the tree which the Lord will show us, which being cast into these bitter waters will make them sweet?

Yes! I think the remedy is close at hand; it is simple; every one, on the bare mention of it, breaks out into the ejaculation, "Assuredly, O, assuredly, it must be so; we must get back to the radiant side of the living Redeemer, back to Christ, back to Christ, out of the chaos of the sects into the accordant harmony and life of yon brooding presence dropping hitherward on the bosom of the clouds." We have staked overmuch on the dead Christ; the sepulchre of faiths; the cadaver, so to speak, of our extinct experiences laid away gloomily in the crypts of the past; we have been harvesting husks; piling our inert theologies together as the dead stones of the field are gathered into a heap; we have now to learn that we must turn from mere moods of effervescent enjoyment, drilled into paroxysm by the unwearyed swash-wheel of evangelistic routine, to the stern cry of the life, to the living Jesus pouring his personal inspirations into our lives, struggling, O, how resolutely, to be caught away from the maddening whirlpool of our evil passions, and in the crisis of our trial—at the moment of it—when the strong eye of failure was staring us down, to feel a virtue coming out from him, more than a match for every crowding emergency before which mere human prowess is as fickle as a reed. Christo-ethical! that is the condensed watchword of the newer theologies, and changing regime, of the better era of the Christian Church upon which we are entering, and which, we pray, the conquering word of God may speedily hasten on.

## ARTICLE VII.

## RELATIONS OF THE BIBLE TO SCIENTIFIC METHODS.

By PROF. S. C. WELLS, PH. D., Roanoke College, Salem, Va.

The earliest revelations to man were in the infancy of his race and in the beginnings of his knowledge. They were made in ways adapted to his habits of thought, as well as this might be with the momentous truths that were their burden.

History cannot write its own beginnings. Only so much, therefore, of these truths were revealed as transcended and would forever transcend his ability to acquire. Moreover the great questions now agitating the scientific mind are merely touched by their graphic pen without argument or detail.

On the other hand, inductive science is built up from phenomena addressed to the senses. Its generalizations are based on these, and necessarily depend for their value, first, on a sufficiency of data, secondly, on the care with which the phenomena affording such data are observed, and lastly on the logical character of the deductions therefrom. Yet the senses which give us information concerning them, though wisely adapted to man's general wants as in conserving his life and promoting his enjoyment are, when trusted as delicate scientific instruments, apt insensibly to betray him, so that for these causes the shores of each age are strewn with the wrecks of theories of earlier ones, once believed and held immutable.

This is not only true of the scientific work of students of mediæval times, but in a degree of that done since science has been placed on the inductive basis. In astronomy, for instance, no belief is held in the Ptolemaic system, as fully as it was once thought to satisfy the problems of the starry worlds. In optics as against the earlier universal belief the progressive movement of light is now recognized and approximately calculated. The four elements of the alchemists have been replaced in modern chemistry by sixty-seven or eight with grave doubts as to

whether there may not be only one which will in the future satisfy all the requirements of the case. Indeed the formula for so familiar a form of matter as water, has been changed in the last thirty-five years.

In this there is no disparagement to science as such. For it must be freely admitted that with better methods and a fuller acquaintance with nature, its modern theories are better expressions of the truth. But from necessity these are subject to limitations of the same kind. In the rich fields of knowledge that which the greatest and most industrious can gather, even when restricted to a specialty, is but the smallest fraction of what is still to be gathered on any line.

As we rise upwards in scientific knowledge on the basis of new discoveries and inductions, bringing to our aid the manifold delicate appliances known to modern work, with the tireless watchings and waitings of the worker, the field of view opens, the sweep of the horizon widens. But a limiting horizon still remains and will until the finite blends with the infinite. This is a consequence and necessity if man is to be wiser to-morrow than he is to-day. As therefore we have supplanted many of the theories of our predecessors, so also, many of our own will in their turn be relegated to the past. As humbling as it may be, this is only in accordance with the methods by which all advances in science are made. It will ever be true to the student of nature, as the cycles of time roll on, as to the student in spiritual things, "now we know in part."

But yet it is to be said that as inconsequent as seem to-day the notions of earlier geographers, astronomers and alchemists, they had in them the germs of truth and although overthrown and derided have borne an honored part, as working forms, in leading up to the more comprehensive and subtle truths embodied in our present ones.

The logical status of the best scientific theories of any age, our own with all its true progress, no less than those which have preceded it, is that they are representatives of our present research and knowledge of their subject-matter. As such they can be used as scaffoldings for the establishment of ultimate truth. So far as the ends and logical necessities of science are

concerned they may be held as true. But in this holding there is no place for dogmatism, least of all for antagonism with that knowledge which rests on a different basis, in that, to meet man's wants, it was revealed to him from above.

The difficulties growing out of the relations of these two kinds of truth, if difficulties exist, are not of conflict in which one must go to the wall dishonored and discredited, but rather in ascertaining what has been proved beyond doubt on the one hand, and what has been explicitly declared on the oath.

Among the points seemingly at issue are those especially in which man himself is concerned, as for instance the date of his introduction into life, the circumstances of that introduction and the unity of the race. All others are secondary and can be disposed of easily in the settlement of them.

It is not proposed in the brief limits of this paper to attempt the discussion of the great questions involved in which the results reached in Biblical criticism, history, archaeology and geology are concerned; but rather to present certain lines of thought bearing on them as suggestions.

Soon after the wonderful quickening that geology received from the labors of Hugh Miller in the classic "old red sand-stone" an issue was joined on the age of man. From the supposed testimony of the rocks this was put at an antiquity of from fifty to one hundred thousand years. As the accepted chronology of the Bible placed this important event at only five or six thousand years ago, it can be understood that the relations between the Bible and scientific methods were strained. Yet as the sequel has shown this was but another illustration of hasty induction from the scientific standpoint. The chronology in question is not a matter of revelation. It is, as is well known, the work of Bishop Upshur who used the best historical and archaeological resources at his command in determining its dates. Since the days of this eminent prelate a vast amount of exhumation has been made under the seats of man's earliest homes as in Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia, the decipherings and comparisons of which have extended backward somewhat the accepted date of his creation. On the basis of such researches and such others as are known in modern use the consensus of

enlightened opinion still places this date at largely less than ten thousand years.

On the other hand the wild estimates of earlier geologists have been steadily reduced as the field covered has been more thoroughly and critically explored. Fortunately for the interests of science, too, his earliest life has been connected with the Glacial age whose date has been brought down by prehistoric archæology, the youngest of the sciences, by methods peculiar to itself, to less than the same ten thousand years. This is, therefore, in practical agreement with the revised chronology.

There is a great deal of interest in this vindication of the Bible by the convergence of independent lines of thought on an issue made. It is however but an illustration of the correlation of all true science and the interdependence of all the members of the great body of truth.

As regards the mode of his introduction it is to be said that apart from the account given in Genesis, whose most obvious interpretation makes him the subject of the creative act in the full exercise of his intellectual physical and moral nature, the only theory of any reputable acceptance is that of evolution. This, it must be admitted, contains some germs of truth in its general application, and is interesting and suggestive as an attempt to solve the profound problem of life from the scientific standpoint alone. We may admit that it has taken strong hold on the scientific mind and been adopted in modified forms and degrees by some of the most vigorous thinkers of the age. We may admit also that it has advanced the cause of truth by inciting to more thorough and precise observation. But it is still true that the theory in question is but an induction from the facts yet in hand. It is merely on trial and subject to the limitations and vicissitudes of the inductive method. It remains to be seen what complexion it will assume when more witnesses have been examined and when those already on the stand shall be more fully cross-questioned; so far evolution has not been proven in any *absolute* sense. As an explanation of the introduction of man into life it is far from satisfactory. Here, indeed, it shows its greatest weaknesses.

For the very first traces of him found in southern Arabia and

in the cities of the Euphrates, his earliest homes, are suggestive of high culture and are fragrant with the capabilities of an exalted humanity. Even at the far-off outposts of his wanderings from the parent hive, where caught by the blizzards and ice caps of the second Glacial age, in northern Europe, where swept into and entombed in the caves of France by the flood agencies of the Champlain period, his skull is found in capacity and form greatly superior and radically unlike those animals that most resemble him. Though there be a difference confessedly among human heads, yet the difference between the cranium of Bismarck, for instance, and those of the pygmies of Stanley, or the low browed citizens of the Guinea coast, is not so great as that between the earliest found man and the tallest ape that walks erect in the counterfeit presentment of man.

The application of scientific methods to the consideration of the question of the unity of the human race as generally understood to be set forth in Genesis and reaffirmed in the New Testament, presents great difficulty. Anatomy, physiology, philology, ethnology and archaeology are all concerned and it is only probably in the convergence of their lines on a common point that a solution may be expected from the scientific point of view. For, several of these used singly have given widely contradictory results.

In this question, that which seems above all others is an historic basis. Accepting, therefore, the letter of the Genetic account of creation as the oldest, science has in many cases sought a theory in a different interpretation of that letter in which equal weight is given to the silence and the declaration of the inspired record. Of an ancient, very ancient and high civilization—of great cities and empires in the remotest parts—the evidence from exhumation and the deciphering of the records so exposed is cumulative in these modern years and overwhelming. Science has amply vindicated the Bible on its historical side, at least. More than this, the scanty outlines of the sacred narrative have been filled out with details of the civilization of the peoples and nations therein but incidentally and briefly referred to as coming in contact with the Hebrews, as for instance the children of Cheth. Exhumation under their ancient seats

reveal the fact that they were the powerful Khatti, rivals of Egypt and Assyria for the empire of western Asia. In the bringing to light of their long buried remains consisting of stone monuments, seals and engraved objects, with the record they give of power and influence, we are reminded of how much there is of ancient history of which we have but few written records.\*

By these means we learn that Pharaoh's officers from all parts of his widely extended dominion sent unto him communications touching the affairs committed to them, written on tablets of burnt clay, giving us a view of the wars and politics of the Canaanites and Hittites long before Joshua came in contact with them. "Among other things in this correspondence we find remarkable confirmation of the sacred and political influence of Jerusalem which the Bible presents to us in the widely separated stories of Melchizedic king of Salem in the time of Abraham, and of the suzerainty of Adonibezec, King of Jerusalem in the time of Joshua."†

The bearings of these wonderful cumulative evidences of a very ancient and high civilization, as also of the concurrent growth of great empires, on the unity of the race from the point of view of science, have led to the assumption of other sources of population before the time of the first pair in Eden. The argument for such pre-Adamites is in the supposed insufficiency of time for Adam's posterity to have covered so much of the eastern world—for it to have so increased in wealth and made such advancement in the mechanic arts and in civil and political organization as they seem to have done, as we catch sight of them in the very early dawn of history. We can, however, have every assurance in the light of researches already made that the teachings of the Bible, as far as they touch the points in issue, will be amply vindicated.

But if there were, indeed, earlier races, their influence on the great Adamic one was but incidental and ceased altogether at the Noachian deluge, when it was eliminated forever as a factor from every practical or even theoretical historical consideration.

---

\*J. W. Dawson.    †J. W. Dawson.

The narrow stream that crossed the Flood, whose widenings and ramifications have since involved the habitable earth, bore with it in unity the fortunes and destiny of man.

In considering the conclusions reached on any of the lines of scientific investigation in their relations to revelation it is always to be borne in mind that the Bible is in no sense a book of natural science. It deals with man's higher interests and destiny as a moral and spiritual agent. Outside this, though touching much that concerns him in his physical environment, only so much has been revealed as it is important for him to know and as he would never have been able to discover for himself. With his endowment of reason—his lively interest in his surroundings—his thirst for knowledge for its own sake and for its subserviency to his necessities and enjoyments, all else could be safely left to him by his Creator as it has been.

In his inability to solve the mystery of creation how blessed a boon the first chapter of Genesis has been. But read at our mother's knee, conned as a lesson, read in the varying moods of our lives, it has insensibly become a part of the stock of our most familiar ideas. We therefore fail to realize the startling character of its descriptions as the penman guided by inspiration, in a few rapid strokes throws out the work of creation as a picture on the background of time. The presentation is as sublime in its shadows as its lights, for that which in silence God has withheld as that which he reveals. Compared with this all the cosmogonies of the nations, left to themselves, are crude and puerile. Moreover, in requiring the Bible to coördinate its statements of scientific truths with the successive forms in which the questions involved have been held from age to age, other considerations arise. The beginning of man's existence as also of all with which he is concerned in the material world, was revealed to him in the childhood of his race, adapted in its form and extent as a revelation to a people simple in culture. Its transmission from father to son through the long patriarchal lives to the time when Moses gave it form, as a part of the sacred canon, was in language characterized more by strength than copiousness and especially deficient in forms for the conveyance of scientific conceptions. Furthermore in the

use of these Scriptures, in the changes of our knowledge of those sciences that fashion our ideas of the references therein made; it is scarcely avoidable that our own preconceptions should insensibly color the presentations of the sacred narrative.

Science is of right the handmaid of revelation. Both are concerned with truth. Between the two as great complementary factors in the body of truth there can be no divorce. For science from its own point of view, with its own methods in the discovery of subtle forces and far reaching laws, can directly or incidentally make no higher discoveries in the wisdom, the power, the beneficence and love of the Creator, than have been claimed for him in the old, old record, and graciously illustrated in all his dealings with man in all the centuries.

As the years shall come and go, as richer stores of knowledge shall be gathered, as wider, bolder, truer inductions shall be sustained, that beautiful harmony which exists between all parts of creation, atom on atom, world on world, will be revealed in a light clearer than the sun. "Now we know in part"—now there may be obscurities and guesses at truth, for we are yet in the beginnings of knowledge. But on the harvest-field of the material world as each of the sciences in its growth shall set up the sheaves of truth it has gathered, these, as in the Patriarch's dream, will bow in obeisance to the sheaf of Revelation.

## ARTICLE VIII.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

BOSCHEN AND WEFER COMPANY, NEW YORK.

*The Lutheran Manual.* By Junius B. Remensnyder, D. D. Author of "Heavenward," "Six Days of Creation," etc. With an Introduction by Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., LL. D., L. H. D. pp. 225. Sent postpaid on receipt of \$1.00.

There could be no stronger or nobler testimony to the revival of church consciousness and churchly activity among Lutherans, than the rapid succession of volume upon volume bearing on the doctrine, history and mission of the Lutheran Church. Nor is there in turn, according to the law of action and reaction, a better or more powerful agency than such literature, for promoting that intelligence, that godliness, and that church loyalty without which the Lutherans are unworthy of their glorious heritage. Let us have these volumes, then, one by one, especially as they do not trench upon each other, and all have the same genuine Lutheran ring, all bear the same stamp of unimpeachable devotion to the evangelical and catholic principles, which have long since been recognized as synonymous with Lutheranism.

How Dr. Remensnyder presents these principles in twenty-four brief and brisk sketches, need not be told our readers. Lucidity, warmth and strength are the characteristics of his style. Add to these the enthusiasm and the love for his church which glow in nearly all his writings, and we would expect, as we find we possess, a volume of uncommon interest. Lest personal prepossessions should somewhat discount our strong commendation of it, we content ourselves with repeating the testimony of a New York daily, which says: "The Lutheran Manual has set forth in a captivating and most serviceable way, the doctrines, usages, spirit and life of the Lutheran Church."

The work is free from a polemical spirit and is not meant to represent any synod or any body of Lutherans, but is a comprehensive portraiture of the universal Lutheran Church—of those great features which are common to our Church everywhere, and its purpose, evidently, is not to widen but to bridge chasms, not to promote divisions, but "to secure a grand and glorious Lutheran unity."

Its simple style makes it a work for the unlearned as well as for the cultured, and its low price puts it within reach of all. No Lutheran home in this land should be without it.

E. J. W.

FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY, NEW YORK.

*Outlines of the History of Dogma.* By Dr. Adolf Harnack. Translated by Edwin Knox Mitchell, M. A., Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary, large 12mo. pp. 567.

Harnack is a critic, the foremost living historical critic of Germany. Like most of his class he has a practical eye for defects, flaws, and blemishes, while he is seemingly purblind when confronted by merits or excellencies. Should you commit yourself to the guidance of such a one in the study of an art gallery, he would show you so many imperfections and inconsistencies in the world's most famous paintings, that the glamour with which you have gazed on the great masters would be dissipated, and only common, everyday productions would remain before your eyes.

The work before us exhibits prodigious learning and uncommon intellectual energy, but both learning and energy are directed to the exposure of the deficiencies, limitations and contradictions which appear on the surface of the history of dogmas, while the author lacks that profounder insight which discovers the inner harmony of conflicting dogmas, and traces their unity in a higher sphere.

"Where order in variety we see,  
And where, though all things differ, all agree."

To Augustine, to Athanasius and to Luther, the Church has always looked up as its greatest uninspired teachers, but according to the analysis to which Harnack's criticism subjects their views, their teachings are only a mass of confusion and contradictions. "So far as Luther left a system of theology to his adherents it appeared as a highly confused and unsatisfactory picture." "Luther resorted to subterfuges which mark a relapse into catholicism." Reckless assertions of this kind discredit the work everywhere, but happily the author's own self-contradictions show him to be about as unsafe a guide as the great luminaries which have from time to time appeared in the Church. On p. 553 he tells us that Luther viewed the sacraments "not as instruments of grace, which secretly prepare future life in men," &c. On p. 558: "Also as regards the sacraments there remained for him still therein a superstition as means of grace."

After this flat repudiation of his own assertion, we are not surprised even at the charge that Luther "did not shrink from speaking of errors in the Biblical writers *in matters of faith.*" His strictures on the orthodox formula adopted at Nice is a sample of the spirit and character which throughout mark the work. "The assertion that the Person in Christ is the Logos, one being with God, could be maintained only when one reversed the interpretations of all evangelical reports concerning him, and understood his history docetically. Therefore the introduction of the absurd, and the abandonment of the historical

Christ in his most valuable traits, is the consequence of the orthodox doctrine."

Dr. Harnack gives no recognition to the Spirit's indwelling in the Church guiding it into the whole truth, nor to that formative energy inherent in the truth as a living power, that inner dynamic process of development which as by a law of necessity is sure, whatever its struggles, to reach organic completeness. "The homoousios finally conquered, thanks to the awkward tactics of the Arians and Eusebians, to the decisiveness of the orthodox and to the determination of the Emperor"—natural agents, all of them. Harnack's school has no place for the supernatural. The most he can give us is that "the history of dogma testifies to the unity and continuity of the Christian faith in the progress of its history, in so far as it proves that certain fundamental ideas of the Gospel have never been lost, and have defied all attacks." "Certain fundamental ideas"—what these fundamental ideas are, we are not told, but the impression left upon the reader is that very few of the original ideas of Christianity escaped uncorrupted from the ordeal to which they were subjected. "Dogmatic Christianity in its conception and its construction was the work of the Hellenic spirit upon the Gospel soil." p. 5. After giving an outline of the Graeco-Roman Religious Philosophy of the first and second centuries, the author tells us in Italics "with this philosophy, the highest the age had to offer, the gospel allied itself." Again, a characteristic of the first century are "those tendencies which served in every way to hasten the process already begun of fusing the gospel with the spiritual and religious interests of the time,—with Hellenism."

Half truths are the worst lies. One-sided, indiscriminate representations of this character are most misleading. That the Church in its organization, "appropriated, piece for piece, the great apparatus of the earthly Roman Empire" is doubtless in part true, but the distinctive and peculiar ideas which constitute the gospel were not received of man. Christianity is not only an original product, but a product that came hither from another sphere. It was planted in earthly soil by the divine hand. It has, doubtless, absorbed whatever elements were necessary to its growth, it has in every clime found affinities and ingredients which have entered into and modified its form, but like the oak which variously affected by soil and climate is found in every country specifically the same, so it is everywhere and always essentially the same tree of life, however diversified in appearance. The forms of statement may in turn be Jewish or Hellenic or Teutonic, the conception is originally, exclusively and permanently Christian, *i. e.*, original with Christ.

Although discredited by the pernicious tendency of the school from which it emanates, the translation of this work will be welcomed by theologians generally. The translator has certainly succeeded in put-

ting it into idiomatic, luminous and forceful English. At times, as in the original, condensation is carried to the point of obscurity, but there are few books of the kind which rival this in felicity and force of expression.

We surmise that some who are familiar with recent controversies in the Lutheran press, will be interested in finding worship described as sacrificial in writings of the second century, and the Church defined as the Communion of Saints by Augustine. Both cases are of course supported by the Scriptures, whence the earliest Fathers derived the ideas and the very terms employed.

The book is printed on heavy paper, in large type, and has marginal index notes, and full table of contents, but a good alphabetical Index should have been added.

E. J. W.

## HUNT AND EATON, NEW YORK.

*The Prophecies of Daniel Expounded.* By Milton S. Terry, S. T. D. pp. 136. 75 cents.

It is a great relief to pass out of a wilderness into an open stretch of country. Such is about the feeling one has in getting the view of Daniel presented here, after wandering through the mazes of theory, speculation, hypothesis and dogmatism, in which this book is generally involved. Dr. Terry holds that the grammatico-historical canon of interpretation is the only one that can justly be applied to this or any other portion of the Bible, that Daniel must be allowed to explain himself, and that neither the presumptions of dogmatists nor the inferences from profane history can have a place in scientific exposition.

He accordingly does not accept the view that the chief mission of Daniel was to foretell the use and fall of the Roman papacy, neither does he believe that the princely seer embraced in his vision ten mediæval European kingdoms, as if from "the labyrinth of barbarous hordes that peopled mediæval Europe" it would be possible to find "just ten petty states or kingdoms that will presumably meet the case."

The little volume is not meant to be a commentary on the Book of Daniel, but consists rather of a series of exegetical essays on the apocalyptic portions of the books and serves especially as an offset against the unsound methods of interpretation to which these prophecies have been subjected. The author holds the four great kingdoms to be the Babylonian, Median, Persian and Grecian. He does not discuss the date or canonicity of Daniel, but he claims that its prophetic elements are of such profound significance and imperishable worth "that, when clearly apprehended in their relation to one another, and in their historical connection with the pre-Christian literature of the Jewish people, they carry with them their own self-evidencing apology." The work is a brief but real contribution to the interpretation of a most difficult portion of Scripture.

E. J. W.

*Exegetical Studies.* The Pentateuch and Isaiah. By Henry White Warren, D. D. pp. 46. 40 cents.

There is nothing stale or staid about these studies. The author is a wit as well as an exegete, and combines with a charming originality a terse and pithy mode of expression that is positively fascinating. He moves the reader both to laughter and to thought, showing himself in either case to be unlike the average expositor. We give a few specimens. "God acted as first groomsman and minister and then declared that two married were one." "Adam named this new being *maness*, the female man, an example followed ever since, every husband and everybody else calls his wife the feminine of his own name—*Mrs. Jones*." God waited until Paradise was completed "before he made Maness—home before wife," which is an impossibility. Eve's exultation "I have gotten a man," etc. "was the beginning of the human habit of setting the time for the millennium—a habit hard to break." Cain's "depth of sin is seen in the fact that he lied when he knew it was no use, as it never is." Jacob and his twelve sons "are not a very promising lot." Along with such sallies are flashes of an opposite character kindling very serious reflections.

The author is not troubled by the higher critics, although his studies relate to their favorite fields. He goes on the assumption that "both in regard to the controverted points concerning Isaiah and those of the Pentateuch conservative students of God's word have as yet no call to surrender." We commend the little brochure both as a tonic for faith and as a specific for the blues.

E. J. W.

*Two letters to a Minister.* By Paul the Apostle. A Biblical Study by Bishop John H. Vincent. pp. 47.

The "Two Letters" of which this brochure of "the Book of Books series" treats are the two Epistles of Paul to Timothy. The author's aim is the adaptation of these Pauline epistles to the Church of the twentieth century. The accomplished Bishop very properly believes that the Christian ministry must be essentially the same in all centuries of the Church and that what won hearts in the first century will win hearts in the twentieth. Proceeding on so sound a basis he gives us a very useful treatise—all too brief.

E. J. W.

A. J. HOLMAN AND COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA.

*Of The Imitation of Christ.* By Thomas á Kempis. With a Memoir of the Author, and an Introduction by Archdeacon Farrar. 4to. pp. 306. \$3.00.

Some books are for the season. Some of them will be read as long as time endures. The *Imitation of Christ* is one of the latter. Written four hundred and fifty years ago by a pious Augustinian Monk it has been ever since the spiritual food of millions, and it is doubtless en-

titled to the claim made for it,—although this claim is contested—that it has been translated into more languages than any other book, the Holy Scriptures alone excepted. Although it is not an infallible rule of faith and practice—an honor which the Bible alone holds, its lessons of faith and hope and charity are most helpful for the inner and the outer Christian life. As a manual of devotion it should be in every Christian home, for it is indeed a book for the high and the low; the rich and the poor; the learned and the unlearned; the righteous and those who have gone astray. It gives comfort to the sorrowing, strength to the weak, and courage to the faint-hearted.

The publishers are entitled to the thanks of the religious world for bringing out the immortal production in such a superb style. It is, without question, the finest, the most elegant edition of it ever published. Type, presswork and binding are of the highest excellence and there are many full page pictorial illustrations of a high order copied from originals, the work of Von Fürich, Hoffman, Thorwaldsen and other great artists.

Altogether the edition is worthy of the theme and history of the book, and of the ready sale which it is sure to command as its beauty becomes known.

E. J. W.

LUTHERAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION, PHILADELPHIA.

*Luther's Small Catechism Developed and Explained.* Prepared and published by Authority of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States.

We do not mean to use the QUARTERLY for carrying coals to New Castle, but it is fitting that this journal should record two monumental things in connection with this catechism. 1. At the first meeting of the General Synod, seventy-two years ago, a committee was appointed to prepare such a catechism. Nothing ever came of it—and, though committee after committee was subsequently appointed, no development of Luther's Catechism ever before succeeded in obtaining the approval of the General Synod.

2. No other catechism ever met such a determined opposition as this one, and yet its merits proved so invulnerable that it finally swept all opposition before it and received the unanimous endorsement of the General Synod at its convention last May in Canton.

The Committee has not been discharged and their work is accepted subject to such changes as may be suggested by the test of practical use, but we venture the prediction that it will undergo no doctrinal change in the present generation.

E. J. W.

*Trial of L. A. Gotwald, D. D., upon Charges of Disloyalty to the Doctrinal Basis of Wittenberg Seminary.* 12mo., 159 pp. Cloth, 75 cts. Paper cover, 50 cts.

This neatly printed little volume is the final outcome of one of the

strangest episodes that have occurred in the history of the Lutheran Church. The assumption was put forward that the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church must in doctrine and worship differentiate itself from all the other Lutheran bodies, and so obstreperously was this assumption maintained in certain papers, and so openly was it countenanced by men who ought to know better, that several gentlemen, whose honorable place in the Lutheran Church is not attributable to their knowledge of its history or its doctrines, went the length of arraigning a theological professor, for teaching "a Type of Lutheranism" characteristic of other Lutheran bodies.

That memorable "Trial," with its unanimous acquittal of the accused, has become history and, probably, the most important chapter of Lutheran history in this country. It must have given infinite annoyance to the sensitive and faithful heart of Dr. Gotwald to be confronted with charges reflecting upon his honor, but this volume makes it clear as noon-tide to all that Providence furnished him the occasion to witness a good confession in behalf of the truth and for the honor of his Church.

The assumption that the General Synod, organized avowedly for the union of all Lutheran Synods, does not hold the distinctive Lutheran faith, is so entirely in the line of the accusations often made by its enemies, that the charges on which Dr. G. was tried are, in effect, an attack on the General Synod. Had they been sustained, it would have given its enemies the greatest triumph they have ever had. They would have exulted in the verdict of the Board of Wittenberg College confirming every accusation they have made as to the un-Lutheran character of the body. Dr. G.'s accusers went even beyond the old assailants of the General Synod. For the latter were content with charging that Lutheran doctrine was not taught among us, the former charge that it dare not be taught.

Dr. Gotwald was equal to his providential opportunity. He has made such an exhaustive investigation of the General Synod's record and has marshaled such an array of testimony from present and former leaders of the General Synod, and withal presented the whole with such clearness and cogency, that it is safe to predict that the mouths of gain-sayers have been stopped, and that the present generation will hear no more about the "Type of Lutheranism" which a Professor's oath warrants him in teaching within the bounds of the General Synod.

Besides Dr. G.'s response to the charges, the little work contains a copy of the charges, copy of the action of the Board, and all the official action connected with the "trial." It makes a volume, which, while costing but a trifle, is so valuable that no intelligent Lutheran of the General Synod can afford to be without it.

E. J. W.

P. S.—We have also received the companion to the above, a pamphlet containing the full stenographic report of the proceedings in the Trial of Dr. Gotwald. Here is richness to which no reviewer can do

justice. Send twenty-five cents to Rev. D. H. Bauslin, D. D., Springfield, O., and secure a copy before the limited edition is exhausted. We are sorry for Mark Twain. His star must henceforth hide its diminished head.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

*Theological Propaedeutic.* A General Introduction to the Study of Theology Exegetical, Historical, Systematic, and Practical including Encyclopaedia, Methodology, and Bibliography. A Manual for Students. By Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D. 8vo., pp. 536.

Just as we go to press we have received from the author a complete copy of this inestimable work, Part I. of which was reviewed in the January number of the QUARTERLY. It is a marvel of industry, a paragon of comprehensiveness and a model of classification. It is intended as a text-book for Theological Seminaries, and is likely to find a place in every one which professes to have a complete curriculum. But it is also a work that will be wanted by all pastors, who failed to enjoy the benefit of Encyclopaedia and Methodology in their Seminary course, and who still have the noble ambition to advance their theological knowledge. The volume takes you like a guide into a vast museum and conducts you from one department to another till you have made a complete survey of its treasures, and have acquired sufficient acquaintance with the subject to prosecute the study henceforth by yourself.

Dr. Jackson's Appendix of a Ministerial Library is a valuable addition to the volume. The publishers offer very liberal introductory rates.

E. J. W.

The following works received from the same house and imported by them will receive a full notice in our next issue:

*Words to Young Christians.* Being Addresses to Young Communicants. By George Elmslie Troup, M. A. Published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, Edinburg. pp. 251. \$1.75.

*The Free Church of Scotland, Her Origin, Founders and Testimony.* By Peter Bayne, LL. D. Published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, Edinburg. pp. 346. \$2.25.

MACMILLAN AND COMPANY, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

*Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament.* After the latest and best Authorities. By W. J. Hickie, M. A., St. John's College, Cambridge. pp. 214.

A pocket edition of a Greek-English Lexicon is quite a desideratum especially when, as in the case before us, it is after the latest and best authorities. Comparatively few among us read their Greek Testaments at sight, and Thayer is too cumbersome to carry with us wherever we go.

VOL. XXIII. No. 4

76

The publishers have also an edition of Westcott & Hort's Revised Text bound in one volume with this Lexicon, and while the print of both is distinct, and considerable other auxiliary material is added, the whole makes a volume no larger than an ordinary pocket hymn-book.

E. J. W.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

*Pagan and Christian Rome.* By Rodolfo Lanciani, Author of "Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries." With 26 full page and 90 Text Illustrations. pp. 374. In Roman binding, with a slip cover. Square 8vo. \$6.00

Rarely has the art of book-making furnished a more exquisite gem than the volume before us on Pagan and Christian Rome. Such a title calls, indeed, for the most artistic work, and the publishers, in appreciation of this, have evidently spared no expense in bringing out a publication worthy in some degree of the magnificence of the eternal city under its imperial and papal sovereigns. The result is a joy to the eye.

The quality of the text is in keeping with that of the mechanical execution. Like the author's previous volume on "Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries," so the present one shows him to be as familiar with the sites, monuments and ruins of the great capital of the Pagan and Christian world as the average man is with the haunts of his childhood. By means of the illustrations, and his own descriptions which are supported by official statistics, state documents, transcripts from monuments and notes from men contemporary with excavations and discoveries, he offers more instruction to the reader than he could ordinarily obtain by a personal visit, while those who have enjoyed the luxury of personally traversing those ancient and sacred localities, where every stone has a history, will find in these pictorial views and clever narratives the exquisite satisfaction of reviewing what they had seen and of confirming or correcting information they had gained on the ground.

The author writes from a strictly archæological point of view. We have not recognized any partisan bias in his statements, nor discovered any other purpose than to furnish the public with authentic history, especially that relating to the religious and material transformation of Rome, a story as suggestive of the relation of Paganism to Christianity, as it is illustrative of the patchwork which characterizes the metamorphosis of temples, shrines and statues of gods and emperors into Christian sanctuaries, memorials and statues of apostles and martyrs.

Some cherished traditions are mercilessly demolished, while some of the most wonderful are upheld and corroborated, as for instance the preservation of Peter's tomb, which is vouched for by "the decisive test" of the discovery in 1594 of the golden cross which Constantine placed over the gold lid of the coffin. That this tomb, bearing a cross of pure gold weighing one hundred and fifty pounds, has been preserved

inviolate amid all the invasions and revolutions which Rome has experienced in eighteen centuries, may certainly be reckoned in the category of the marvelous.

Other relics of apostolic times are pointed out, and the statue of Hippolytus puts it beyond doubt that the Christian sculptors modeled excellent portrait-statues in the second and third centuries. But the author refutes the theory of the modern Petrographists, that the bronze statue of St. Peter is the Capitoline Jupiter transformed into an apostle. "It never held the thunderbolt in the place of the keys of heaven," though there is no doubt of "a great similarity between the two, in the attitude and inclination of the body, the position of the feet, the style of dress, and even the lines and folds." It is not unlikely that with a slight alteration of features the apostle in bronze was modeled after the effigy of the deity. The comparatively modern shape of the keys tells also against "the current opinion which makes it contemporary with the erection of Constantine's basilica." They may, of course, be a comparatively recent addition.

Of intense interest is the history of the erection and destruction of the famous churches, the conversion and remodeling of Pagan temples, successive additions to original designs, repairs, and restorations. The destruction of old St. Peter's, which Constantine had erected "over the tomb of the blessed Peter" to commemorate the defeat of Maxentius, is justly regarded as one of the saddest events in the history of the ruins of Rome. The author's regret for it is not alleviated by the fact that he holds the presence of St. Peter, as well as of St. Paul, in Rome, to be "established beyond the shadow of doubt by purely monumental evidence."

We cannot pursue our notice farther, and we close with the humble judgment that the student will find this volume to be as splendid a contribution to history as it is a beautiful specimen of art. E. J. W.

*The Nature and Elements of Poetry.* By Edmund Clarence Stedman.  
12mo. pp. 338.

This most attractive little volume by the ever delightful banker-poet, comprises a series of eight lectures delivered as the initial course in the Turnbull Memorial Lectureship of Poetry at Johns Hopkins University in 1891. This is the only chair of its kind in America, and, so far as known, the only other one dedicated to the study of poetry alone is that endowed at Oxford by Henry Birkhead in 1708. Mr. Stedman thinks that when any cause or art is neglected by the public, its lovers are but the stronger in their devotion, and to his mind, poetry will be the voice of the future as of the past, fulfilling, in its highest achievements, Ruskin's definition, that "Poetry is the suggestion, by the imagination, of noble thoughts for noble emotions."

In these opening lectures the author has made a careful and most ex-

haustive elementary study of the absolute nature of poetry, and treats "of the quality and attributes of poetry itself, of its source and efficacy, and of the enduring laws to which its true examples ever are conformed." He divides all poetry into two main results, creation and self-expression, or objective and subjective. He sets forth in the different chapters his ideas on this creative element; the melancholia arising from the expression of self; makes a careful examination of the attributes qualifying the art; of beauty; of truth in relation to the realistic, instructive and ethical side of poetry; and gives some fine thoughts on the inventive imagination and passion, those two qualities which, as he says, whether the one or the other be first aroused, "speed together like the wind-sired horses of Achilles." The final chapter or lecture is a scholarly discourse on what Wordsworth called, "the faculty divine," and Mr. Stedman cites many instances of the power, the inspired gift of God, that is behind mere industry.

The entire book breathes of love for the beautiful, in art, in song, in life. The graceful writer knows well how to handle his seemingly indefinite subject; so well, in fact, that ere the first few pages have been read the influence of his own devotion can be felt and one is confident that poetry can be defined, and subjected to the same true tests all thoughtful students are wont to apply to any art or science.

Any allusion to Mr. Stedman's charming style is quite unnecessary in these days, since he already stands among the very first of our American writers, and when he gives us of his rich store of culture we turn to whatever it may be with the self-same feeling that a weary student sits him down before some well drawn, restful picture that not only instructs, but both refreshes and enriches the mind too often tired with the prose of every day life.

C. W.

MACMILLAN AND COMPANY, NEW YORK.

*Essays on Literature and Philosophy.* By Edward Caird, M. A., LL. D. 2 vols.

We have here two volumes of studies in "*Literature and Philosophy*" by Edward Caird, the distinguished author of "*The Evolution of Religion*" noticed in the last QUARTERLY. The first volume is made up almost exclusively of literary articles contributed at various times to the English Magazines, whilst the second volume is but a transcript of Prof. Caird's articles in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* on "Cartesianism" and "Metaphysic."

There is a special charm in the literary articles on Dante, Goethe, Rousseau, Wordsworth, and Carlyle,—since they are not essays in literary criticism—in which line there is much written, now-a-days, which has all the seeming of the writer's individual caprice—but they are attempts at discovering the attitude of these epochal poets and writers, con-

sciously or unconsciously, toward the fundamental principles of philosophy as these are apprehended by the school which Prof. Caird represents. Thus Dante is considered in relation to the theology and ethics of the Middle Ages; Goethe in his attitude to contemporary philosophy; Rousseau as the representative of the passionate outburst of *individualism* in politics, education, and religion; Wordsworth as influenced by Rousseau and the French Revolution; and Carlyle as the great leader in the revival of a spiritual view of nature and history, and a reaction against the skepticism and materialism of the eighteenth century; all under the influence of imported German metaphysics.

These discussions all have a wider range, and have the merit of being lucid and consecutive, as distinguished from the ordinary groping method of looking at the works of genius, as a labyrinth to be penetrated without the tether of Ariadne's thread. All these great men are made to answer, finally, at the bar of the New Hegelianism, of which the University of Glasgow is the conspicuous center, and in the expounding of which this distinguished Glasgow Professor is the recognized head.

There is a most intimate relation between literature and philosophy; they enmesh; they share the same material in a thousand ways of subtle reciprocation; or, rather, as Mr. Caird has more than once had occasion to explain, if literature, after the fashion of Matthew Arnold, is to be called the "criticism of life," it is so because, under the creative impulse, it throws the highest philosophical ideals into concrete embodiment, into the artistic realization of aesthetic form, to be seized immediately by the imaginations of men. Mr. Caird is convinced that creative genius has never found nourishment in the cold crystalline air of a mechanical and materialistic philosophy—and that the dominance of that way of thinking, now, gives no promise of an outburst of imaginative fecundity in our day; but he is just as confident that the comprehensive idealism of the school he represents will bring back "the golden clime" in which the poet is born.

This is, in the main, the drift of the disquisition injected into this charming first volume, on the "*Problem of Philosophy at the Present Time*," a delightful and summary statement of the author's theory of the universe, as a satisfying and inspiring synthesis of the whole world, nature, soul, and God, and not, as in the reigning systems of the day, a stern facing of irreconcilable dualistic antagonisms forever. The comprehensive discussions of "*Cartesianism*" and "*Metaphysic*" in the second volume cover the same ground and enforce the same lesson—and are, virtually, an invitation to men of genius to come and drink at this fountain.

W. H. W.

## HUNT AND EATON NEW YORK.

*Pulpit and Platform Sermons and Addresses.* By Rev. O. H. Tiffany, D. D., LL. D. pp. 251.

The selection here made was done under the supervision of J. Wesley Johnston, of Brooklyn. We are impressed with the discrimination and excellent judgment shown. The sermons are on the following subjects: Oratory, The Preparation in Study, The Cross, John's Question and Christ's Answer (Matt. 11 : 2-4), Thanksgiving, Christmas, The New Birth, The Things which are Cæsar's, The Silence of Christ, Jacob's Vision, One God in Nature and in Grace, A Woman's Influence (Ruth 1 : 19). The addresses are on Abraham Lincoln, Personal Memories of U. S. Grant, American National Character as affected by Immigration, The Yosemite Valley. Dr. Tiffany's attractive style and brilliant word-painting are too well known to need a word from us. The living voice, however, and the magnetism of the man, are not present in the cold type and the addresses and sermons suffer somewhat on this account. But even with this loss they are exceptionally attractive and will be highly enjoyed by the reader.

*Illustrative Notes.* A Guide to the Study of the Sunday-school Lessons for 1894. By Jesse Lyman Hurlbut and Robert Remington Doherty. pp. 396.

The comments are original and selected, and along with them are given methods of teaching, illustrative stories, practical applications, notes on eastern life, library references, maps, tables, pictures and diagrams. The previous volumes under the same men give assurance of the excellence of the one before us. The notes are fresh and scholarly, the whole fully abreast with the scholarship of the age. Everything available has been put under contribution and the result is a credit to the authors. The Sunday-school teacher will find this one of the best helps he can secure.

*Life's Battle Won.* By Julia A. W. De Witt.

The incidents of this novel belong to the times when the late war ravaged the land and the story recalls most vividly scenes in the homes hospitals, prisons and on the battlefields of those stirring times. Sectional feeling is controlled by the writer and there is but little of it to be found on these pages. It is a sad story, one that at its beginning is full of happy, hopeful, ambitious characters but as it proceeds, disappointments, losses, sorrows, deaths, and desolation occur, and while the heroine, after being bereft of earthly friends and loves, devotes herself to humanitarian work and finds in it much to compensate, comfort and elevate her, the reader lays it aside with the wish that, notwithstanding the admirable lessons it teaches, it might have contained more of human happiness and less of sadness.

*Thoughts on God and Man.* Edited by Joseph B. Burroughs, M. D.

This is composed of selections for every day in the year. They have been taken from the sermons of Frederick William Robertson, or as he is called—"Robertson of Brighton." As they are the thoughts of a man who was noted for his eloquence, earnestness, lucid explanations and his own insight and comprehension of the Scriptures, it is not surprising that they are characterized by beauty, purity and an evident appreciation of the noblest things in this life and a looking to the better ones of the life beyond. High and noble living is likely to be the result where each day is begun by such reading.

---

#### THE HISTORICAL PILGRIMAGE.

##### A NEW IDEA IN PEDAGOGICS.

The *Review of Reviews* (New York) comes forward in its October number with a second startling innovation in educational projects, as fresh as and still more unconventional than the Gouin system of language-learning, which it championed last year.

Two articles explain the history and *raison d'être* of the Historical Pilgrimage, and tell of the revival of this pleasant institution in England and America, with a most alluring program for the 1894 Pilgrimages.

In England, Mr. Stead, the English editor of the *Review of Reviews*, is going to personally conduct a party of Pilgrims to the many points of absorbing historical interest which a two week's jaunt, from London as a center, will allow. The most eminent men in England will be of the party, and will address it at the famous stopping places. Think of going with Archdeacon Farrar to Westminster and hearing his words on the historical significance of that venerable pile! A. Conan Doyle, the novelist, Canon Fremantle and other celebrities will make speeches at *rendezvous* where they are especially appropriate.

But while England perhaps has much more history and tradition to the acre than our new world, the schedule of the American Pilgrims seems scarcely less charming. They will leave Philadelphia and spend some weeks in finding such historical sites as Boston and New York and Long Island and the Hudson can afford. The itinerary embraces, very happily, visits to such institutions as the Century Company's great establishment in New York, the extensive Midvale Steel Works, and the Cramp Shipyard. In their own particular fields such men as Richard Watson Gilder, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Prof. John Fiske, Pres. E. Benjamin Andrews, William Lloyd Garrison, and Thomas Janvier, will join the excursionists and make speeches.

One of the most charming features of these jaunts will be the spirit of *camaraderie* which will pervade the students and teachers and great

men alike who make up the party. Every earnest student will be welcomed, and an additional pleasant consideration is that there is no money in it for anybody. In fact when one reads Mr. Howell's detailed program in the *Review of Reviews*, one can only wonder at the good and careful management which has brought the total probable costs per excursionist down to such a small figure. Here is what Mr. Howell has to say about the possibilities of the Historical Pilgrimage:

"The Historical Pilgrimage will stir the imagination of the average American, vivify for him a too monotonous existence, quicken his interest in an heroic past and give him an appreciation of a fruitful present. It may not solve the problems at issue between Jefferson and Hamilton; it may tell him nothing concerning the relative merits of monometalism and bimetallism. It will at least manifest the conditions under which our great heroes won or lost their laurels. A visit to Saratoga may show more clearly than our books that Benedict Arnold was a disappointed and ill-used soldier before ever he was a traitor to his country. A pilgrimage to Valley Forge is needed to prove that Gettysburg would not to-day use up six pages of Baedeker's United States had not Baron Steuben in that bitter winter of 1777-78 transformed an untrained, hungry, frozen, naked yeomanry into an effective army, while Washington in his stone cottage burnt the mid-night oil in planning, counseling and co-ordinating the contrary and rebellious elements in the army and in congress. The pilgrimage has a clear title to a place in a schedule for the democratization of historical study, because its function is to furnish the uninstructed many with an historical appreciation, without which historical scholarship of the instructed few is lame and patriotic as sounding brass. If as Lord Acton said, history is the conscience of mankind, all thoughtful persons should hail the historical pilgrimage as a certain means of quickening or supplying this conscience to the masses to whose intelligence, as Washington long ago warned us, we must look for the safety and permanence of our free institutions."

